THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

TITLES are misleading. The prospective reader of Professor F. C. GRANT'S latest book, *An Introduction to New Testament Thought*,[1] will be quickly undeceived if he imagines that the book is a simple primer on New Testament Christianity. It is, *per contra*, a large and learned tome on the religion of the Bible written by one who is *au fait* with the latest trends in advanced criticism and replete with provocative *obiter dicta* on religion and life generally.

Let us take as example his last chapter which deals with New Testament ethics. When a writer tells us (as GRANT does) in the course of a few pages that 'the religion of the Bible is simply not concerned with politics at all,' that 'the Gospel is the greatest agrarian protest in all history,' and that we Protestants are paying dearly to-day because we have preferred conversion (on the Pauline pattern) to patient ethical indoctrination, we sit up, and take notice, and protest.

Has the religion of the Bible nothing to do with politics? If GRANT is right, then Amos and Isaiah were pure transcendentalists with their vision completely averted from the human situation, and their dreams wholly centred in another world; and all our Christian Socialists from Maurice and Kingsley to Archbishop Temple and Dr. George Macleod have been barking up the wrong tree. But we have a shrewd suspicion that the American Professor is wrong.

His second assertion, that the gospel is the greatest agrarian protest ever, seems, *prima facie*, equally absurd. But there is more in it than appears at first sight. Consider the ethics of Jesus as we find them in the Sermon on the Mount. They are redolent, from start to finish, of the life and ways of the countryside. To us who live in a highly urbanized and industrialized society, they come with all the sweet freshness of a wind that has blown over valleys and fields of springing corn; they testify to another and nobler way of living than we know. This, unless we wholly mistake him, is the Professor's point. The Genesis story of the Garden of Eden and of man's expulsion from it is a profound myth of the transition from a primitive to a civilized life. This transition was the point of entrance of *political* evil into the world. For in our essential nature we are not 'economic men' or 'political men' (as our present-day ideologists suppose) but children of God, born upon earth and destined to be re-born for eternity. Some day (let us hope) we shall return to that profound conception of human life, if only we can get through this present world-wide 'time of troubles' (to use Toynbee's phrase) which began with the break-up of Western society in the sixteenth century, and has been accompanied by endless wars and bloodshed as nations have fought for territory and markets and by the prostitution of modern science, culminating in the atomic bomb.

Professor GRANT'S third thesis is also worth pondering. Simply stated, it is that the central concept of Biblical ethics is that of the family. In the idiom of Jesus, we are the children of God, meant to live as sons and daughters of our heavenly Father. But if a family is to live properly, it must have certain clear rules of behaviour. ('It will not do to dismiss the New Testament ethics—or, for example, the Epistle of James—as a mere survival from Jewish legalism or "a relapse into mere moralism."') Paul tried at first to substitute ecstatic devotion to Jesus for rules of behaviour—but had in the end to fall back on them. Augustine's 'Love, and do as you like' is equally dangerous. It is really a not too profound piece of antinomianism ('a characteristic little jewel turned off by Augustine's sparkling fifth-century rhetoric'). Both Paul (in his earlier phase) and Augustine are bad guides for us. The curse of modern Protestantism is that instead of patiently inoculating its adherents with moral principles it prefers Augustine's maxim and Paul's theory of conversion. Hence the total lack of discipline in modern Protestantism, in an age when society has grown barbarous and cruelty has flourished as in no previous period of history. And the remedy? A return to 'mere morals'! It was

[1] Abingdon-Cokesbury; $3.75.

the *moral* character of the Church in the first three centuries which enabled her to criticize and condemn the world ; and to-day the Church's witness must be the same. On the dark scene in which we live the Church must turn the pure light of another world ; and only by her ' achieved sanctity and self-discipline ' will she persuade men that she has in her hands the secret of the life that is life indeed.

The surge of interest in textual and historical study of Christian origins has in the younger generation been displaced by a concern for the theological statement of Christianity with a fresh emphasis on the Biblical basis for far-reaching dogmatic conclusions. Dr. Edward Thomas RAMSDELL'S *The Christian Perspective*[1] offers a powerful vindication of this attitude.

At the beginning of this century enthusiastic effort was being made to establish by scientific inquiry the primitive facts of the Christian religion in the conviction that once this was done reason would be guided to a proper formulation of doctrine. Reason was in charge, alike in the preliminary investigations and in any subsequent theological construction raised upon the foundations discovered. To-day it is maintained that this approach inverts the Biblical and psychological order. Before any reasoning takes place about the facts they hold us up with their demand for an immediate acknowledgment that they confront us as the Word of God. The first moment in religion is the recognition that we are at a crisis beyond which we can pass only after bowing to the authority of a revelation. Christ, the Bible, the Church are not presented for our examination that we may make something of them ; they come as the living Word of God telling us what God makes of us. Only on the basis of obedience to this Word can reason proceed with its activities.

Any clash between reason and faith is, according to Dr. RAMSDELL, avoided by the recognition that a judgment of value precedes any reasoning. A decision of faith, made in an existential moment of crisis, sets the facts in the perspective in which they remain while reasoning proceeds. So in a sense the conclusion is in control from the start. No unprejudiced thinking is possible in real life. Thus no purely objective scientific information is conceivably procurable about personality lying within ' I ' and ' Thou ' relations. All that is possible in this region is intimate evaluations such as in fact constitute the Biblical witness to Jesus. Only those touched by His goodness have anything valuable to say of Him.

Dr. RAMSDELL is, however, by no means uncritical of the newer School. He notes the amazing fashion in which Schweitzer, Bultmann, Barth, and Brunner can speak of the unimportance of the earthly life of Jesus. And readers who remain undaunted by his difficult speculative chapters will find reward in reaching the lucid and trenchant psychological and ethical treatment of the matter in the chapters on man and his sin.

Some readers of Dr. RAMSDELL'S book may not have the time or diligence to become familiar with all the writings he surveys. Those who wish to be theologically up-to-date but feel baffled by the verbosity and turgidity and fluidity of the output of many famous moderns will be grateful for Dr. E. L. ALLEN'S seven little books[2] offered as *Guides to the Thought of Barth, Brunner, Maritain, Niebuhr, Jaspers, Heim, and Berdyaev,* which are brief but lucid and wonderfully adequate for their size. Those not impelled by them to the originals may have some confidence that they have really had the kernels of seven very thick-shelled nuts.

The fullest of these *Guides* is that on Barth. His theology is a reaction from Schleiermacher (on whom Hugh Mackintosh's not quite fair judgment is here accepted) and the Ritschlians (though Dr. ALLEN does not note that Barth is rather an advance from than a reaction to Herrmann) and the religious-historical school ; and it is largely influenced, as in his famous phrase ' *totaliter aliter* ' by Kierkegaard. Barth's impulse to theology came from his idea of what preaching is—a proclamation not of the preacher's opinions but of the Word of God to and about men. Revelation means that God is not discovered but discloses Himself, and this He does in the Cross and Resurrection of Christ. His latest work Dr. ALLEN regards as less uncompromising, but it includes a total repudiation of Natural Theology and holds the Trinity to be not a dogma arrived at by reasoning but a datum of revelation.

On Brunner Dr. ALLEN notes his slightly acid disavowal of any close relation to Barth, and chooses as most distinctive in Brunner's fertile output his doctrine of man, as a being whose nature is to be called to obedience to God in a social community. This means that love rather than the Kantian categorical imperative is the mainspring of action. But impulsive individual

[1] Abingdon-Cokesbury Press ; $2.50.

[2] Hodder and Stoughton ; 2s. net each.

acts of love like the good Samaritan's do not cover a situation such as is met with in an epidemic or an earthquake. Organization is then necessary; and this is true in many other relations. So with the realism which is always difficult to keep free from sophistry Brunner discourses on the institutions of a sinful world which in spite of their imperfections have to be accepted as ordinances of God to be made the best of in the practical interests of love.

Niebuhr and Maritain are both concerned with the bearing of theological doctrine on society and politics. Niebuhr has in the background of his thought his early insight into the working of American Capitalism in the Ford enterprise which he had when minister at Detroit. Maritain writes with experience of the changing relations between Church and State in France at peace and then in two wars and during an occupation.

The existentialism of Jaspers has won from Barth the enconium that it is 'almost prophetic.' Acknowledging the limitations of the academic traditional philosophy, Jaspers holds that existence finds men in 'limit' situations such as death, pain, conflict, guilt, in which the transcendent is encountered and reason finds that the message of tragic life is either despair or faith.

Heim, whose teaching Dr. ALLEN characterizes in the phrase 'Jesus our Leader' largely reiterates to a new generation Herrmann's emphasis on the impression of the Person of Jesus as the fundamental matter in Christianity. While his belief in a personal power of evil is meant to increase the seriousness of the issue it is doubtful whether this does not tend, like every attempt to explain evil, to lead to a facile optimism.

Along with Dr. ALLEN's little *Guides* may be taken a fuller study—*Nicolas Berdyaev*, by Mr. George Seaver,[1] on the jacket of which is a really beautiful portrait of the Russian thinker. His is a philosophic mysticism identifying the Divine and the human and seeing in the victory of existential time over historic time the attainment of human freedom in God as the centre and meaning of life. In his dismissal of all idea of collective units and his stress rather on personality as the only reality Berdyaev has at his service the distinctive Russian word '*sobornost*' which means integrated fellowship without uniformity or loss of individuality. To Buber's 'I' and 'Thou' relation he would add that existence always contains a 'we' relation. One cannot say 'I' without affirming both 'Thou' and 'We.' This means participation in creative love which operates in eternity not in time and by which man realizes his mystic unity with God.

Is there any consideration that will prevent or overcome the apparent clash between reason and faith in all the various brands of authoritarianism or mysticism which claim to be truer to the facts of life which are expressed in personalism and existentialism and the belief in the direct impact of the Divine word? The Very Rev. W. R. MATTHEWS in his Essex Hall Lecture, *Reason in Religion*,[2] finds it in a refusal to identify reason and reasoning. If the essential function of reason is taken to be synthesis then analysis and logical inference are secondary features. The intuitive insights of morality and art are in some sense rational. Religion and philosophy alike aim at an interpretation of the whole of experience, religion tending towards complete understanding and philosophy towards a culmination in worship. Philosophy, as much as religion begins with faith, with the acceptance of data. But religion, as RAMSDELL has noted, includes in its beginning a value judgment of the special significance of certain aspects of what is given.

[1] James Clarke; 6s. net.
[2] Lindsey Press; 1s. 6d. net.

St. Paul in the Twentieth Century.[1]

By Professor A. M. Hunter, Ph.D., D.Phil., D.D., The University, Aberdeen.

Some eighty-five years ago Renan delivered himself of this judgment: 'After having been, owing to Protestantism, for three hundred years the supreme Christian doctor, Paul sees in our days his reign coming to an end. The writings of Paul have been a peril and a stumbling-block, the cause of the principal defects of Christian theology; Paul is the father of the subtle Augustine, the arid Aquinas, the sombre Calvinist, the sour Jansenist and the ferocious theology which predestinates to damnation.'

It is obvious that Renan did not love 'the ugly little Jew' from Tarsus. But it is no less obvious that the father of such a formidable progeny must himself have been a very considerable man, not to be easily prophesied out of his greatness by an accomplished writer who, as one of his critics observed, 'cared more for beauty than for truth.' In fact, of course, the prophecy has not been fulfilled. From Renan's day to ours no year has passed without adding fresh volumes to the already immense library of books about St. Paul. Renan underrated the true magnitude of his man, and it may safely be predicted that so long as Christianity lasts, men will turn afresh to these letters written from Corinth, Ephesus, and Rome which even his enemies admitted were 'weighty and powerful' (2 Co 10^{10}). Karl Barth saw deeper into Paul's secret when he wrote in the Preface of his now famous commentary on the Romans: 'Paul, as a child of his age, addressed his contemporaries. As prophet and apostle of the kingdom of God, he veritably speaks to all men of every age. . . . If we rightly understand ourselves, our problems are the problems of Paul; and if we be enlightened by the brightness of his answers, those answers must be ours.'

What was he, this wandering little tent-maker from Tarsus whose writings have been such a ferment in Christian theology for nineteen hundred years? Mystic or mystery-monger, ecstatic or eschatologist, systematic theologian elaborating dogmas or hero of piety to whom Christ meant more than Christology, truest interpreter of the gospel of Christ or its greatest perverter? All these views have had their champions in the last fifty years; and we shall have to consider them. But we must first turn to the letters themselves and see what light fifty years have shed on problems of authenticity and provenance.

[1] The Lee Memorial Lecture for 1950 delivered in St. Giles Cathedral, Edinburgh, on 28th May 1950.

I.

Turn up a New Testament Introduction of fifty years ago and you will probably find that the first words on any of St. Paul's Epistles deal with authenticity. Open one of recent vintage, and in only one or two cases does the question seem to warrant discussion. The change is significant. In 1900 the ghost of Baur of Tübingen (who acknowledged as genuine only Romans, Galatians, and 1 and 2 Corinthians) was not yet finally laid, and there were still cranks like the Dutchman Van Manen capable of denying the genuineness of the whole Pauline corpus.[2]

Nowadays the only letters which are in real doubt are Ephesians and the Pastorals.

It must be confessed that the controversy about Ephesians has made little headway. Most British scholars accept it; many Germans reject it; and some, like Dean Inge, confess that when they read the letter in English they are sure it is Paul's, when they read it in Greek their doubts awake. Goodspeed's attempt to solve the riddle of Ephesians is interesting. Ephesians, he guesses, is an 'introduction' to the first collection of Paul's letters made by a Colossian (perhaps the runaway Onesimus) about A.D. 85 when the publication of Acts had revived interest in St. Paul who had been almost forgotten after his death. But, at most, it is a pure speculation; and some of us find it easier to accept the view which remained undisputed for eighteen hundred years in the Church.

What of the Pastorals? Was Paul the Pastor? It must be allowed, I think, that the case against the authenticity of the Pastorals has been materially strengthened in the last half century. When the linguistic objections are marshalled as P. N. Harrison marshalled them in 1921[3]—with an almost bewildering wealth of statistics—the conservative reply looks like so much special pleading. On the other hand, who can doubt that, say, in 2 Ti 4 we are listening to the authentic Apostle? The truth seems to lie with those (like E. F. Scott and Harrison) who hold a hypothesis of fragments. Some brief notes of Paul to Timothy and Titus probably fell into a disciple's hands. With these as nucleus he composed the Pastorals, issuing them in Paul's name—and not unreasonably. Did they not give effect to much of Paul's teaching, and

[2] In the columns of the *Encyclopædia Biblica*.

[3] *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles*.

did they not incorporate genuine sayings of the Apostle?

So much for authenticity. Two problems of destination and provenance have exercised the critics of the last fifty years:

(1) Who were the foolish Galatians?

(2) Where did Paul write his Prison Epistles?

The older among us will readily recall the controversy about Galatia which Sir William Ramsay, fresh from archæologizing in Asia Minor, set agoing at the beginning of the century. Paul's addressees in the letter (he argued) were the people of Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe in the *Roman province* of Galatia, not the Gauls in the North. Thus began a debate as heated as any ever waged over the site of Mons Graupius or Hannibal's route across the Alps. What has been its issue? In 1920 C. H. Turner declared that Ramsay had 'swept all opposing theories from the field.' This is an exaggeration. The Germans (partly, I suspect, because the theory was not made in Germany) were by no means persuaded by Ramsay. But, in this country, we are now almost all 'South Galatianists,' and I cannot think of a recent British commentator on Galatians prepared to defend the old view.

Where did Paul write his Prison Epistles? In Rome? In Cæsarea? Or in Ephesus? Tradition points to Rome. Not many have favoured Cæsarea. But what about Ephesus? In 1900 Lisco of Berlin stated the Ephesian case. In his *St. Paul* [1912] Deissmann murmured his approval. And in 1929 G. S. Duncan gave us his full-dress exposition of the theory. It was obviously an issue of some importance; for, if established, we should have to revise our whole picture of St. Paul's spiritual pilgrimage.

Prima facie, the theory seems improbable. Does not Philippians refer to 'the saints of Cæsar's household' and 'the Praetorian Guard'? But when we learn that the Greek *praitorion* means simply 'Government House' and that there were many such in the Roman Empire, and that 'Cæsar's household' was a sort of Imperial Civil Service of which (as we know from inscriptions) Ephesus had representatives, we are not so sure. Our confidence receives another blow when we ask ourselves: Is it likely that the ten (or so) friends of Paul named in the Prison Epistles all followed him to Rome?

At this point we may rightly object that Acts says nothing about an Ephesian imprisonment. True, but Acts is a far from complete account of Paul's doings, and odd pieces of evidence in the Epistles (*e.g.*, 1 Co 15^{32} and 2 Co 1^{8}) plus some extra-canonical evidence[1] lend colour to the Ephesian theory. And it is undoubtedly true that the Ephesian theory provides a likelier setting for some of the data in the Prison Epistles. (For example, Ephesus only one hundred miles from Colossæ is a likelier refuge for the runaway Onesimus than Rome, which was eight hundred miles distant.)

How has the new hypothesis been received? C. H. Dodd rejects it *in toto*,[2] and only one or two have gone all the way with Duncan. But most think it far from impossible, and judge the case for assigning Philippians to Ephesus to be strong. On the whole issue, some will prefer the testimony of tradition; but the debate is still very open, and some of us never feel very confident when we speak of Philippians as Paul's 'swan song' from Rome.

[1] *E.g.*, The Monarchian Prologue's statement that Colossians was written from Ephesus: 'The Apostle when bound wrote to them in Ephesus.'

II.

From these literary problems let us turn now to the mind of Paul which the letters reveal. Paulinism was the name for it at the beginning of the century; and though the word is not so fashionable now as then, there has been no lack of interest in the thing itself. We need mention only the name of Karl Barth to prove that 'the father of the sombre Calvinist,' being dead these nineteen hundred years, yet speaketh, albeit with a Swiss accent and a Kierkegaardian emphasis. The great man of Basel apart, however, we have had books in plenty on Pauline theology, books which, it may fairly be claimed, are less doctrinaire, less dull, and more vitally concerned with the living issues in St. Paul than were their counterparts at the end of the last century. Instead of cataloguing them, we propose to select three of the salient problems which they raise, and to indicate the commonly accepted answers.

Was Paul a Hebrew of the Hebrews, or a Hellenist of the Hellenists? Forty years ago this was a very live issue.

That Paul here and there used Stoic terms like 'conscience' or Stoic ideas like that of 'the inner law,' as his dialectical style sometimes reminds us of the Stoic diatribe, this was not new, this we expected in one who hailed from Tarsus. The matter became serious when, in the early years of the century, Reitzenstein and other German scholars began to assert that Christianity according to St. Paul was deeply in debt to the Greek mystery religions which, in Paul's time, offered salvation to many sick souls in fear of fate, the malefic influence of the stars, annihilation, and what not. The charge was that Paul had changed the gospel of Christ into a full-blown mystery-cult —'a generalized blend of Attis, Osiris, and

[2] *Rylands Bulletin*, January 1934.

Mithras, wearing as a not too-well-fitting mask the features of Jesus of Nazareth.' [1] Paul might testify that to the Greeks his gospel was mere ' foolishness ' ; Reitzenstein and Co. knew better. It was not merely a matter of his having borrowed odd words from the Greek mysteries ; his mysticism, his sacramental doctrine, his worship of Christ as ' Lord,' all came from the same source. They did not stop to consider that their knowledge of the mysteries was really very scanty, that this amazing transmogrification of the gospel must have taken place within twenty years, and that if Paul derived his message from his environment, he did what no other missionary has done—borrowed his gospel from the people among whom he worked.

The mystery hypothesis has now lost caste in the world of scholarship.[2] Looking back on it now, one wonders how Reitzenstein and Co. managed to ' sell ' it to so many scholars. Had they completely forgotten not only Paul's own claims but his manifest debt to the Old Testament (in a Greek dress, of course), his rabbinical dialectic, his eschatology ? In any event, other scholars (among whom let us name H. A. A. Kennedy) were not slow to leap to Paul's defence. They did not deny that Paul used words like ' salvation ' or ' lord ' also common to the mysteries ; but they did assert that he used them differently, and that the Old Testament was a far likelier Pauline source-book than the liturgies of the mystery-mongers ; and they flatly denied that Paul had turned a simple ' Galilean Gospel ' into a cosmic drama of redemption modelled on the mysteries. In the ensuing rout of Reitzenstein and Co. none dealt more trenchant blows than Schweitzer, though it has to be confessed that his own attempt to interpret Paul's theology in terms of ' consistent eschatology ' is hardly less grotesque. Now, at the end of the half century, the wheel has come full circle once again ; for in his *St. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* [1947] Professor W. D. Davies has successfully shown, at point after point, how Paul, despite his apostleship to the Gentiles, ' remained, as far as possible, a Hebrew of the Hebrews, and baptized his rabbinical heritage into Christ.' ' The stronger a man's natural quality,' said John Oman, ' the more likely he is to remain racy of his native soil.' So it was with Paul. Though we cannot deny that Hellenism was *one* of his ' tutors unto Christ,' we may be very sure that the sub-soil of Paul's thought remained Jewish to the very end.

Our second question is not unrelated to the first one. It is quite simply, Jesus or Paul ? Who founded Christianity ?

In the first two decades it was thoroughly discussed. Indeed, there was no burking of it. For if the Liberal picture of Jesus was true, how did ' the Christ cult ' arise ?

Wrede found the answer in current Jewish beliefs about a celestial man. Before Paul became a Christian he believed in a heavenly Messiah. On his conversion he simply transferred to Jesus this Christ dogmatic. His Christology really owed nothing to the historic figure of Jesus. Others, as we have seen, found a Greek answer. It was under the influence of the Greek mysteries that Paul turned Jesus into a redeemer God.

If few scholars nowadays level this grave charge at St. Paul, what has made them revise their opinion ?

First, Schweitzer and others showed the Liberal Jesus to be a figment of the critics' imagination.

Second, the re-discovery of the eschatology in the Gospels—and, in particular, the better understanding of the Kingdom of God which we associate with Dodd and others—gave new and vast dimensions to the central Figure in the gospel story. It confronted us with One who knew Himself to be the all-decisive Person at a supreme crisis in God's dealings with men.

Third, scholars, like Denney who studied the self-revelation of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels, recalled us to a Person who knew Himself to be the Son of God in a unique and lonely sense. (See, for example, the Q passage ; Lk 10^{21-24}, Mt 11^{25-27}.) We began to see that the Christology of Jesus Himself revealed One who was not unworthy to bear the weight of the lofty claims which Paul made for Him.

Fourth, the gulf which had seemed to yawn between St. Paul and the Primitive Church was well-nigh bridged. Fifty years ago a clear contrast between Paul and the creed of the Primitive Church was almost a dogma of critical orthodoxy. All that is changed now. We have begun to discover how much Paul owed, theologically, to his Christian predecessors.[3] We have learned that the *kerygma* which he preached did not differ essentially from that of the earliest apostolic preachers.[4] To be sure, it fell to Paul to explore the fact of Christ in ways that never came within the horizon of the original Jerusalem apostles ; but there is no record that they ever disagreed on the question of Christology. If Paul called Jesus Lord and set Him on the Divine side of reality, so did they. If Paul acknowledged Jesus' name to be the only

[1] N. P. Williams, in *Essays Catholic and Critical*, 391.

[2] E. R. Goodenough's recent attempt in his *By Light, Light* [1935] to prove the existence of a (Hellenistic) Jewish mystery-religion to which Paul may have been indebted has not persuaded the experts.

[3] See my book, *Paul and His Predecessors*, and J. Weiss, *The History of Primitive Christianity*.

[4] C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments*.

saving name under heaven and knew that one day he must stand before Him as Judge, so did those who were ' in Christ ' before him.

All these things have helped to clear Paul of the charge of being the arch-corrupter of the gospel. As Vidler puts it in his recent book : ' The idea is now discredited (though it popularly persists) that beneath the surface of the Gospels we can unearth a purely human prophet of the Divine Fatherhood and human brotherhood who was transformed by St. Paul into a supernatural Saviour.' [1] We are realizing that to separate Jesus from Paul is as absurd as to try to explain the movements of the planets without reference to the sun. Historic Christianity stems from Jesus, not Paul ; but the Apostle to the Gentiles was, if not the first, perhaps the greatest of His interpreters.

Let us take as our third and final question, What did Paul find in Christ and the gospel ? It will raise the whole problem of Paul's mysticism, and enable us to note some recent trends in Pauline interpretation.

The answer of traditional Protestantism has been : ' Justification by faith.' So Luther judged, and in his hand the doctrine

> became a trumpet, whence he blew
> Soul-animating strains.

But our twentieth-century interpreters do not agree. ' That the so-called doctrine of justification is so prominent,' declares Deissmann, ' has less an inner than an outer cause. The fight against the Judaisers and the Law compelled Paul thereto.' Schweitzer too judges it a fragment, not the whole. It is, he says, ' a subsidiary crater which was formed within the rim of the main crater—the mystical doctrine of redemption through being in Christ.' And recently W. D. Davies has described justification by faith as ' one metaphor among many others employed by Paul to describe his deliverance through Christ.'

This last judgment seems justest. Justification, for Paul, is only the initial step on the way to salvation—the initial assurance of God's pardon to the sinner who confesses his faith in the atoning Christ—and it is only in Galatians and Romans where Paul has the Judaisers and salvation by works clearly in his eye, that it bulks large.

The answer commonly given to our question in modern times is : union with Christ. ' The religion of Paul,' says Deissmann, ' is quite simple. It is communion with Christ.' ' Union with Christ,' wrote H. R. Mackintosh, ' is a brief name for all that the apostles meant by salvation.' And Schweitzer's *magnum opus* on Paul's theology [2] is one long exposition of ' redemption through being-in-Christ ' which he interprets in a mechanically eschatological way, so that, at baptism, the process of the believer's dying and rising with Christ, without any exercise of will on his part, ' starts working in him like machinery which is set in motion by pressing a spring.'

This is of course to make nonsense of the part played by faith in Paul's Christianity ; but it poses the question, What does ' being in Christ ' mean ? Deissmann defines it as ' the most intimate fellowship imaginable of the Christian with the living spiritual Christ.' Just as the air we breathe is in us and fills us, and yet we also live and breathe in the air, so is Paul's fellowship with Christ.

Who can doubt that this is a true account of the matter, so far as it goes ? But does it go far enough ? Does it do full justice to all Paul's uses of the phrase ?

Interpreters since Deissmann have rightly noted that the formula has often a *corporate* connotation, so that to be ' in Christ ' means also to be included in ' the corporate personality of Christ which is manifest in the Church.' So it is in such a passage as Ro 8[1] : ' There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus.' Obviously being in Christ involves membership in the Ecclesia which is His Body. ' Christ and His People,' writes G. S. Duncan, ' form a corporate fellowship, so that to be in Christ means to be a member of that religious fellowship which draws its very life from Christ.' In short, Pauline mysticism is no flight of the alone to the Alone : rather (as Davies observes) being in Christ is a social concept ; it is to have found the true community. And when a man by faith, of which baptism is the seal, enters that community, he enters mystically into the virtue of all that Christ, his Head, has done for him by dying and rising again.

This is new and true light on what being ' in Christ ' means. We may welcome it without however being convinced that it is the best answer to our question.

The wisest answer, in my judgment, is to be found in Anderson Scott's *Christianity according to St. Paul* [1927], perhaps the best book on Paul's theology which the half century has produced. What Paul found in the gospel of Christ was ' salvation.' It was that for which his contemporaries, both Jewish and Gentile, were seeking. It was that which Paul found when the living Christ ' arrested ' him on the Damascus Road and commissioned him as His herald. ' The gospel,' Paul said, in his greatest definition of it, ' is the power of God unto salvation for every one that has faith.' This salvation, for Paul, has three aspects. It is a past event, a present experience, and a future hope. As a past event, it rested on

[1] *Christian Belief.*

[2] *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle* [1931].

' the finished work ' of Christ, and might be called justification (acquittal), redemption (deliverance), and reconciliation. All three described the initial stage in the salvation offered by God to men in Christ. To it man's right response was ' faith,' *i.e.*, utter trust in the living Crucified, of whose reality baptism was the sign and seal. But salvation is also a present experience. It means to be ' in Christ,' to live, by the power of the Spirit, the life that is life indeed in the fellowship of the new People of God, the Church, which is Christ's Body. This new life is one of sonship to God, its finest fruit is love, and its appointed nourishment is the Lord's Supper. Finally, salvation is a future hope. It can only be realized completely when with Christ's Parousia and the consummation of all things, sin and death are finally overcome and the redeemed, in heaven, are not only ' in Christ ' but ' with ' Him.

So to regard Paul's Christianity is to see it in its wholeness. It is to put justification and being in Christ in their proper places in his thought. It is to glimpse the true width and grandeur of Christianity according to St. Paul. And all of it lies latent in the first verse of the fifth chapter of the Romans : ' Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ ; By whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God.'

III.

No account of Pauline studies in the twentieth century would be complete without a word of epilogue on the re-discovery of Paul the man. Was it Chrysostom who said : ' Though he was an apostle, he was also a man.' Our twentieth-century scholars have disinterred the living man from the dead weight of Paulinism under which, at the end of the last century, there was a danger of his being smothered. Nothing better has been written on this topic than Dean Inge's essay on St. Paul in *Outspoken Essays* (First Series). ' In the nineteenth century,' he says, ' Paul was obscured behind Paulinism. His letters were studied as treatises on systematic theology. . . . The name of the apostle came to be associated with angular and frigid disquisitions which were rapidly losing their connexion with vital religion. It has been left for the scholars of the present century to give us a picture of St. Paul as he really was—a man much nearer to George Fox or John Wesley than to Origen or Calvin ; the greatest of missionaries and pioneers, and only incidentally a great theologian.' T. R. Glover also has done much to humanize the Apostle and make him less of a parchment saint or a Teutonic professor of systematic theology. But it was the men who went back to study the Anatolian lands where Paul's work was done, Ramsay and Deissmann, who did most to re-create for us the living man. These two, more than any others, delivered Paul ' from his eighth imprisonment in the paper bondage of Paulinism,' put him back into his proper milieu, ' the world of the olive tree ' and helped us to see him as he really was in life : a small, dynamic, fearless man moving restlessly among the cities of the Levant, raising either a riot or a revival wherever he went, working with his own hands to keep himself alive for his great task, writing non-literary letters (not stiff Epistles) to his spiritual children in Thessalonica, Philippi, Corinth, Galatia ; a man dominated by a great ambition to preach the gospel in Rome ; a man to whom Christ meant more than Christology and God more than the doctrine of God ; a man of almost polar opposites—physically weak yet immensely tough ; utterly humble yet also utterly sure of the great rôle God had called him to play ; tenderly affectionate yet also (when moved) stern, irascible, volcanic ; subject to depression, yet radiant amidst the storm and stress of life and invincibly sure of God and Christ ; a man of his times, a Pharisee captured by Christ, full of rabbinical dialectic, no sex-equalitarian, believing in mystical visions, in evil spirits, in a three-storeyed world ; a man speaking and writing the Koine Greek of the age with a Semitic accent, mixing with all sorts and conditions of men, Jewish and Gentile, and undergoing such hardships and persecutions as few men have undergone ; yet withal never for one moment doubting Him ' in whom he had believed ' and ' persuaded that he was able to keep that which he had committed unto him ' until the great day of the Lord.

This is the man who stands before us in the pages of Ramsay and Deissmann. Beside him the other apostles seem almost shadows. ' Alone he breathes and lives,' says Dean Inge, quoting Homer on the seer Teiresias among the dead, ' while they flit as phantoms.' Paul the man from Tarsus, Pharisee of the Pharisees, Apostle to the Gentiles ; first of Christian mystics ; most dynamic of Christian missionaries ; bond-servant of Jesus Christ, the man who under God did more than any other to set Christ's ' hallowed fire ' blazing in the world, the most illustrious name in the roll-call of the saints.

Living Issues in Biblical Scholarship.

Is there a Theology of the Old Testament?

By the Reverend A. S. Herbert, M.A., B.D., Professor of Old Testament Literature and Interpretation, Selly Oak Colleges.

In view of the many theologies of the Old Testament produced by Continental scholars during the last fifty years, to ask the question 'Is there a Theology of the Old Testament?' may seem unnecessary or even impertinent. It is a curious fact, however, that British scholarship has not been prone to writing such works. Davidson's posthumously published *The Theology of the Old Testament* (1904) is the only work by a British scholar to which one can refer. It is deeply to be regretted that Wheeler Robinson was prevented by death from writing the theology of which his *Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament* (1946) was to have 'constituted the prolegomena.' The form that it would have taken may be indicated by the relevant sections of his books *The Christian Doctrine of Man*, *The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit* and *Redemption and Revelation*, and his essays in *Record and Revelation* (Oxford, 1938). But the question goes beyond a discussion of books on the subject. Inevitably one is involved in questions about the Authority and Unity of the Old Testament, its relation to the New Testament, the manner in which we approach the Old Testament as *preparatio evangelica*, the part it must play in a Christian Dogmatic. Is the study of the Old Testament to be a part of the comparative study of religion, is it the field of *Dogmengeschichte*, or can it furnish the material for a *Dogmatik*? How are we to deal with the problems raised by the fact that the Old Testament revelation is necessarily bound up with history. 'First the religion had a long history, so that to try to systematize it in a theology is like trying to count a flock of sheep that will never keep still. . . . Secondly, revelation in the Old Testament was mediated through history, so that it cannot be disengaged from history without reducing it to something like a valley of dry bones' (C. R. North in *Scottish Journal of Theology*, II. ii. 115 f.). How can one present a theology of a religion which has moved from the relatively unreflective faith of the nomad to the theological heights of Is 40–55, from the confident kerygma of Amos to the speculation and questioning of Ecclesiastes?

Obviously the Old Testament is not a theological text-book; neither does it contain a systematic theology. Indeed the nearest approach to a credal statement in Dt 6^{4} raises difficulties of translation and exegesis, as a glance at the R.V. and marginal readings shows. Also in Dt 26^{5-9} we have what has been described as the 'Historical Credo of Israel,' and it is possible to trace a similar pattern as the basis for some of the Psalms; cf. Ps 105 and 106. This is not theology, but such passages should be borne in mind as being, like the primitive baptismal confessions of the Christian Church, the starting-point of theology. No such development takes place in the Old Testament even in the Wisdom literature. Nevertheless, while in the Old Testament there is no articulated system, we can recognize that the Priestly strata of the Pentateuch reflected a firmly held theology, that the Book of Job is wrestling with a generally accepted, but inadequate, theology, and that in Is 40–55 there are profound theological insights. Equally clearly, however, there are considerable differences between the Priestly and other strata in the Pentateuch, between the Servant Songs and Obadiah (whose name means 'The Servant of Yahweh'), and between Job and Ecclesiastes. This simply leads us back to the original question, 'Is there an Old Testament Theology?'

The raising of the question at this time is an indication of the course pursued by Old Testament study during the last one hundred and fifty years. Before the nineteenth century (and by many since that date) it was generally accepted without question that the Old Testament was on a flat level of inspiration. For that matter it was in theory (though not in fact) regarded as on the same level as the New Testament. The theory broke down in practice, for many parts of the Old Testament were treated, not in their plain and obvious meaning, but allegorically in terms of the New Testament, or indeed in terms of a theology which required even some distortion of the New Testament. For those who accepted such a point of view the question would probably be meaningless. There could be no Old Testament Theology as distinct from New Testament Theology, and no Biblical Theology as distinct from Philosophical Theology. It was therefore necessary to find the doctrine of the Trinity in the seraphic hymn of Is 6, and the words of Gn 1^{26}: 'Let *us* make man in *our* image, after *our* likeness.' There are obvious difficulties in such a use of the Old Testament, but many of them could be disposed of by

the skilful use of allegorization. The weakness of the allegorical method is seen, however, not merely in its eccentricities, but in the fact that it may lead to widely different interpretations of the same passage, and that it must be firmly held within an authoritative theology. That is to say that it is bringing theology *to* the Old Testament and requiring the Old Testament to fit that theology, rather than seeking a theology *of* the Old Testament and so bringing the teaching of the Church before the tribunal of the Revelation in Holy Scripture. Further, there are parts of the Old Testament which are, as they must be, tacitly ignored by those who come to it with such presuppositions. The difficulties are in fact insuperable. (For a sympathetic and patient treatment of this point of view, cf. H. H. Rowley, *The Relevance of the Bible*, chs. 1 and 2, and *The Rediscovery of the Old Testament*, ch 1.) This would suggest that the presupposition should be questioned.

The last one hundred and fifty years of Old Testament study has relieved the pressure of the older difficulties—frequently by demonstrating that the particular difficulties arose out of an inadequate theory of inspiration and authority. The fact that the Old Testament as we have it is the deposit of a long history is now taken seriously. The historical situation and the character of the speaker or writer are recognized to be, with the actual words, the media of revelation. An important conditioning factor in the Divine revelation is, it would appear, the need of man; and the living situation which Moses or Deborah were called to meet was of a different kind from that confronting the eighth century B.C. prophets, and this in turn differs from that of the period of Antiochus Epiphanes. No less important is it to consider the difference in function between those through whom the revelation comes, for example, between priest and prophet. The recognition of these differences and the reasons for them, does not pre-judge the authority of the word, spoken or written. Neither does it necessarily suggest that there was a ' progressive revelation ' from the beginnings of Israel's history until the end of the Old Testament period. Indeed there is much in the Old Testament, particularly as it is understood in the light of modern scholarship, which makes any evolutionary theory of Israel's religion untenable. It does, however, help us to recognize, and insist that we take seriously, the fact that Israel and her spokesmen were always heirs, and conscious heirs, to the insights of those who had gone before. We may sometimes see the mountain peaks emerging from the clouds which cloak the foothills, and appearing to float in the sky. But we know in fact that they are integrally related to the solid earth, and that the very shape and location of the mountain is only to be understood in terms of the geological history of the whole country. So we can never appreciate the words of Amos or Jeremiah without seeing them within their living situation and in relation to the continuing life of Israel. We may prefer the phrase ' continuing revelation ' to ' progressive revelation.'

A whole set of problems and difficulties are thus disposed of, since they do not arise out of the Old Testament, but rather from a false theory of the Bible, namely that it is on one level of inspiration and authority, from beginning to end *ipsissima verba* of God, with a narrow and quite un-biblical understanding of the Word of God. Attempts to explain away the differences are both unnecessary and impertinent. Both the differences and the similarities are part of the data, and the historical approach has prepared the mind to accept the fact.

If, however, some of the *theoretical* difficulties have been removed, certain new *practical* difficulties arise. If this historical approach to the Old Testament is necessary to a true understanding, we must know, not only the history of Israel, but the living situations in which the various books (and often the various parts of individual books) come into being. This is primarily the task of literary and historical criticism. No less important for a proper appreciation of the message of the Old Testament is the work of the textual critic and the philologist. Other disciplines, too, must be called into service, for example archæology and the study of comparative religion. Many a passage in the Old Testament receives a new dimension of meaning in the light of Mesopotamian culture, or the myths and ritual of Ugarit. This is not to equate the religion of Israel with that of her neighbours, but to recognize the living situation in which Israel's religion took shape. That it could have been just another of these Semitic religions is recognized by the Old Testament writers themselves, notably by the prophets and the Deuteronomic writers. The battle against syncretism had often to be fought; the protagonists of the ancient tradition were often rejected; yet they gained the victory as the final acceptance of their words shows.

Enough has been said to indicate some of the important practical difficulties. We cannot always be sure that any particular document is a literary unity. We can be even less dogmatic about the date and historical situation in which some parts of the Old Testament arose. The task of presenting a History of the Development of Israel's religion is beset by innumerable and perhaps insuperable difficulties. Perhaps this too is in part due to an untested presupposition. The student of the Old Testament to-day is less

inclined than formerly to assume that the religion of Israel 'progressed' in a straight line, still less that it evolved, from recognizable humble beginnings to the magnificent product of the post-Exilic Age. He recognizes rather creative moments in Israel's history, initiated by men of God, notably the prophets; and the patient and loyal guarding of a great tradition, notably by priests and disciples of the prophets; while the majority either ignored or were only partially and very slowly won to the faith.

Now this is precisely the material for a theology of the Old Testament, as distinct from a study of the religious beliefs and practices of the Israelites throughout their history. We return to what we noted earlier. The Old Testament does not profess to offer a systematic theology. It is a record of revelation. Now revelation is not a catalogue of propositions about God; it is God making Himself known (in the Hebrew sense of this verb) to man, disclosing Himself to man. This is a meeting of Person with person. As this appears in the Old Testament, this comes through events of history, interpreted by those who were committed to the will of God, as acts of God. The classical and regulative self-disclosure of God according to the Old Testament is to be found in the events of the Exodus, the Covenant and the Entry into Canaan. As a part of these events, Moses is called of God to make known to the people the activity of God in this creative moment. They are to be His people, He will be their God, though they have not 'known' Him in any effective sense before. The Divine initiative and His self-disclosure as Saviour and Lord are thus made known within the events of history and in the life of a people. There is much more of His character and purpose which they could not know at that stage, and could only know as they responded to His rule in trust, loyalty, and obedience. But it is to Him who had thus revealed Himself that the prophets summon their people to return, and in this prophetic response come further insights as they see Him acting in living situations. To this revelation, the whole of the Torah bears witness, and it is celebrated in the songs of Zion. It is the faith of Israel, often forgotten or perverted, constantly renewed and creative of fresh insights, recognized by the New Testament writers as the heritage of the Christian Church, which it is the proper task of Theology to explore and express. Whether the categories normal to theological thinking are adequate to the task may be questioned. But full justice must be done to the personal, dynamic, and historical quality of Biblical revelation, and the fact of Israel as the people of God in whose life, responding and rejecting, this revelation has clothed itself.

Literature.

THE WORK AND WORDS OF JESUS.

The want of Lives of Christ from the pens of reputable New Testament scholars has not infrequently been noted and regretted during recent years. There are, of course, notable exceptions, such as the short sketch by Professor H. G. Wood in Peake's 'Commentary,' and the larger works of Bishop Gore, Dr. Maurice Goguel, and the late Dr. C. J. Cadoux; but, none the less, the silence is remarkable. No doubt it is due to the depressing effect of Schweitzer's 'Quest of the Historical Jesus,' but even more to the influence of Form Criticism and the abundance of critical questions, still unsolved, on which the writing of a Life of Christ depends. Happily, the tide is turning, and Professor A. M. Hunter's *The Work and Words of Jesus* (S.C.M.; 12s. 6d. net) is a sign of what may be a new flow. So much progress has been made in the study of the basic questions, especially those relating to the Kingdom of God, Eschatology, the Son of Man, and the Servant of the Lord, that a period of reconstruction appears to be at hand.

Let it be said at once that Professor Hunter has shown great courage in this undertaking, for much that he says will be questioned by scholars who take a different view from his own; and it is much easier to object to this detail and that than to supply a better construction. He has also attained much success in providing a moving and virile portrait of the Person and purpose of Jesus.

The book contains an interesting discussion of the pre-critical period and the study of the Life of Jesus in the twentieth century, and gives a very competent account of the sources, the chronology, and the geographical, historical, and religious background. The Birth, Temptation, Early Judæan Period, the Galilean Ministry, and the Travel Period, together with the Last Journey to Jerusalem, and the Passion Story are treated in detail. A different method is adopted in the middle portion of the story, in which procedure by rather bold conjecture alone is possible. Here Professor Hunter finds an opportunity to discuss such vital themes as the Mighty Works of Jesus, the Training of the Twelve, the Kingdom of God (with a notable

leaning toward realized eschatology), the Teaching of Jesus concerning Himself and about His Death and the Future. It is in this part of his treatment that he shows admirable skill in relating and assembling the results of two decades of discussion, and in making them serviceable to the scholar and the general reader alike. The Appendices, occupying some sixty pages, give a critical setting to the Gospel sources, in Q, M, and L.

In general, Professor Hunter relates most closely the teaching of Jesus concerning Himself and the Kingdom to the ideas of the Son of Man and the Servant in their bearing on the doctrine of the Cross. Perhaps undue caution is displayed in discussing miracles and the Resurrection narratives, for the much praised work of Mr. C. S. Lewis has settled little in these fields except the thesis that miracles are impossible; but in these matters Professor Hunter will find many readers who share his views. The style is easy, and much knowledge is carried easily, while the quotations are never burdensome, but often very helpful and illuminating. The author is to be congratulated on a fine achievement and it is to be hoped that his book will find many readers.

VINCENT TAYLOR.

THE CONCEPT OF DEITY.

The Concept of Deity, by Professor E. O. James, D.Litt., D.D., Ph.D., F.S.A. (Hutchinson; 18s. net), based upon his Wilde Lectures delivered in the University of Oxford, promises that, although it is primarily intended for students of comparative religion, philosophy, and theology, the needs of a wider public have been kept in view. This broader purpose would have been more fully served if the style had been simpler and clearer, and the general design had been more easily apparent, but efforts to understand and appreciate will be richly rewarded. At the outset, Professor James takes up a very definite attitude upon certain points which have recently been matters of controversy. In the first place he thinks that comparative religion should not be confined to the higher religions only; secondly, the study should not be merely anthropological, descriptive, and scientific, but should be associated with a consideration of philosophical and theological implications. Further, he holds that the line of demarcation between Natural and Revealed Religion—which has caused so much searching of heart for Gifford Lecturers and others—has worn exceedingly thin, and revelation has become an inductive category for the interpretation of scientifically ascertained facts, instead of being regarded as a body of infallible dogmas from which everything else may be tidily deduced by means of the deductive method.

This attitude is full of promise, and the achievement is substantial. Primitive religion is respectfully treated in an illuminating chapter. Otto's idea of the 'numinous' is regarded as fundamental, and the purely social theories of Durkheim and Levy Bruhl are rejected. Neither do generalisation theories, such as those by which Herbert Spencer and Frazer seek to reduce the number of the gods, find much greater favour. Rather is attention drawn to the prevalent concept of the High God, or All-Father, which is the partial justification of the otherwise not well-founded belief in an original monotheism. This belief in a High God, however, was not ritually effective. Such gods tended to retire from active service, and so did not contribute greatly to the triumph of monotheism over against polytheism.

Nature worship and the development of Indian pantheism are discussed in two chapters. As regards the latter the judgment of the author is adverse; the unification it brings is to be welcomed, but the sacrifice of the individual and the resultant fatalism are too heavy a price to pay, and pantheism 'cannot be the final solution of the problem of Deity.' Whether anthropomorphism, rooted in the doctrine of analogy, can be a safe guide in the construction of the concept of Deity is next discussed, and the struggle towards monotheism and the emergence of ethical problems in the long drawn-out dualistic conflict between good and evil is made to suggest religious insights of the highest value. The author holds that it was Moses and the Hebrew prophets who made the most notable contribution to the monotheistic evaluation of religious experience.

The most profound—and the most difficult—part of the book is in the last three chapters, in which the author carries out his purpose of going beyond description to a consideration of philosophical and theological implications. The development of the philosophy of theism, which he defines as 'standing between the two extremes of a wholly transcendent and a completely immanental principle,' is traced through the centuries. The traditional theistic proofs are brought into relation to the eighteenth century triumph of mechanism and rationalism, and to the transition to the attitude influenced by evolutionary concepts. The modern efforts of Bergson, Alexander, and Whitehead to transform emergence and creativity into Deity are trenchantly criticized, and their inadequacy is indicated in a quotation from Dr. C. C. J. Webb—'the religious consciousness demands not only a prospective but an actual God, already possessing all to which we can aspire.' Incidentally, a severely adverse judgment is passed

on Barthianism, on the ground that it is wholly on the side of transcendence, and fails to keep the middle path between this and a pantheistic immanentism. But it is allowed that Neo-Calvinism stresses the importance of bringing philosophical theism into connexion with the religious conception of God. An intensely interesting chapter deals with the topic of 'The God of Religion,' and the key to an adequate notion of Deity is found in the Christian emphasis on Incarnation with its deepening of the meaning of the Fatherhood of God.

The concluding chapter—on Revelation—is a little obscure and diffuse, but, with the help of a useful historical account of the development of the idea of revelation from its primitive beginnings in ecstasy and divination up to its highest embodiment in the 'Word become Flesh,' it carries further the author's initial contention that any rigid separation between Natural and Revealed Religion is no longer possible, and that more help may be got from the distinction between 'general' and 'special' revelation, based on the doctrine of 'degrees of disclosure and illumination.'

W. S. URQUHART.

CHURCH STRATEGY IN A CHANGING WORLD.

The Bishop of Sheffield, Dr. Leslie S. Hunter, was invited to give the Lichfield Divinity Lectures last year, and these have now been published under the title of *Church Strategy in a Changing World* (Hodder and Stoughton; 6s. net). On the jacket of the book the publishers declare that this is 'the most fearless and forthright book on Christian living and witness since Sheppard's *Impatience of a Parson*.' It is difficult to understand exactly what purpose a needlessly provocative statement like this serves. Many a likely reader may be put off by it, having suffered many things at the hands of the fearless and forthright in times past, and having by now concluded that forked lightning as an illuminant is apt to disappoint.

Most of all it seems to be unfair to Dr. Hunter himself, for he writes, as we might have expected, with great dignity and restraint, obviously aware that the problems to be faced do not yield their solution to us if only we scream loudly enough. Here, indeed, is a wise survey of the situation to-day as it reveals itself to the Bishop of an industrial diocese. The note of evangelical concern resounds through every chapter. Dr. Hunter feels that we have not yet done nearly enough in the effort to reach the artisan and the technician. We do not even fully understand the extent of the conditioning to which they have been subjected through the agency of the Industrial Revolution. 'They are mass-producing and mass-produced.' 'They are little interested in politics apart from wages. They may be deeply suspicious of the bosses, but they rarely attend either Trade Union or political meetings. They pass adult education by. They are not, in their present state, a good basis for a democratic state.'

When he comes to the chapter where he suggests what the Church's strategy ought to be, Dr. Hunter makes it plain that he will have no contracting-out by the Church from its plain duty to save Western culture and civilization. An evangelism that is prepared to rest content with winning men one by one is plainly not enough. 'It is only too true that for many a manual worker to join the local Church and become one of its membership means in practice stepping out of his class or the fellowship of his mates.' What the Bishop is out for is the conversion of whole groups and whole classes. 'Ever since the household of Chloe was added to the Church in apostolic days down to the Christian mission in contemporary India and Africa, the Church has drawn into its fellowship whole societies and groups, as well as converting individuals in the evangelical sense. It must be so.'

As to how this is to be done some more detailed suggestions follow, and many in all the churches will sympathize with the Bishop when he says that the Church to-day is cluttered up with organizations and societies which began as auxiliaries and have gradually become parasites. If we are to build bridges to reach those who appear meanwhile to be inaccessible, and to gain whole classes and groups, it might not be the least rewarding part of our strategical conception to come to an agreement with Dr. Hunter as to which of our many time-wasting organizations we could successfully and swiftly inter. Then the real task could be undertaken in earnest.

It will take some time before a Christian strategy likely to be successful in this new age is fully worked out. We should meanwhile be grateful to the Bishop of Sheffield that he so clearly shows us the beginning of the way forward.

R. J. WEDDERSPOON.

SAINT ANTHONY.

One of the most valuable of all series of volumes on patristics is the series entitled 'Ancient Christian Writers' which emanates from the Catholic University of America. The latest volume to appear is St. Athanasius, *The Life of Saint Anthony*, translated and annotated by Robert T. Meyer, Ph.D. (Newman Press, Westminster, Maryland; $2.50). The Life of St. Anthony is important because of two reasons. First, it is the most important document of early monasticism,

and, second, it is the inauguration of Christian biography. Undoubtedly St. Anthony was one of the greatest figures of the Early Church. Even pagans came to him saying, 'We must see the man of God.' Every generation will read again the story of his temptations, of his fight with the demons and of his conquest of evil. In the course of it Athanasius pays him a great tribute. 'He so championed the cause of the wronged that one would think that he himself, not the others, was the injured party. . . . It was as though a physician had been given by God to Egypt. For who came to him in grief and did not return in joy? Who came weeping for his dead and did not immediately put away his mourning? Who came in anger and was not transformed in friendliness? What down-and-out pauper met him, and seeing him and hearing him did not despise wealth and feel consoled in his poverty? What monk grown careless did not gain new fervour from a visit with him? What young man coming to the mountain, and seeing Anthony, did not promptly renounce pleasure and love chastity? Who came to him plagued by a demon and was not freed? Who came to him with tortured mind and did not find peace of mind?' It is the perfect picture of a father in God who could help others because he himself had been tempted.

Dr. Meyer has done his work well. The translation is excellent and full of grace. The notes are fuller than usual in this series and lay under tribute the very latest works and authorities.

WILLIAM BARCLAY.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT.

'Introductions' to the New Testament by their preoccupation with problems of authorship, date, and the like, commonly fail to give any adequate impression of the faith and life of the New Testament itself. It is the prime merit of *A Fresh Approach to the New Testament*, by Canon H. G. G. Herklots (S.C.M.; 7s. 6d. net), that it seeks to lead us to the apostolic writings by the same route by which their first readers came to them. Canon Herklots rightly sees in the New Testament 'the propagandist literature of a widespread and successful missionary movement,' and sets us in the midst of it. First he brings before us the missionaries themselves, then he takes us to the mission-field and shows us the rival faiths which sought to possess it. Next he passes to the message, the gospel which the first missionaries proclaimed, and the moral teaching in which they trained their converts, discovering herein the factors which contributed to their success. (Of especial interest here is the use made of the Decalogue in the Epistles.) Then we see a missionary party at work, and read rapidly through one of their letters (Philippians in the Bishop of Bristol's lively translation). Other aspects of Church life are illustrated in a chapter on 'Hymns, Creeds and Cathechisms.' Finally there is explained the process of transition from the preached message to the written Gospels. The whole is admirably conceived and carried through, easily written in non-technical language, and while eschewing arid detail, is in its small compass a mine of the results of the best recent research. It is most warmly commended to a wide circle of readers.

A. D. ALEXANDER.

Quite a number of books are still being written on the ever-present subject of Communism and Christianity. One of the latest is *Communism and Christian Faith*, by the Rev. H. Ingli James, B.D., B.Litt. (Carey-Kingsgate Press; 6s. net). It may confidently be commended as a safe guide to all who wish to study the subject. Full justice is done to Marxism, and full attention is given to what Marxism has to offer. Mr. James makes what he calls the Christian rejoinder most effectively, and he has obviously studied the whole question thoroughly. The book deserves a wide sale, and should be particularly useful for the puzzled layman.

In the selection and editing of these vigorous, straightforward, beautiful, and evangelical sermons —*The Religion of a Common Man* (James Clarke; 7s. 6d. net)—his friends have provided a worthy memorial of the preacher, the late Rev. Robert Prenter, M.A. One would wish to have heard these sermons, and to have reached through personal experience and not merely by the printed word the conclusion that the ministry they represent must have been singularly fruitful and lasting in its influence. This little volume will be a mine of suggestiveness for preachers, and an inspiration for them and other 'common men.'

This symposium—*African Ideas of God*, edited by the Rev. Edwin W. Smith (Edinburgh House Press; 21s. net)—in which twelve missionaries, all with considerable experience, take part, deals with the possible answer to the question whether the indigenous African can be said generally to have attained to a belief in a Supreme Being. The survey covers the southern two-thirds of Africa, and the data which have been collected yield a confused welter of conclusions, amongst which it is difficult to detect a general trend or principle of synthesis. The editor, Dr. Edwin

Smith, who has already many books to his credit, makes a valiant attempt to introduce order. The general impression produced is that three levels of belief may be discovered, and partially distinguished. The term dynamism is used to indicate a belief in magical properties and charms, unified by a conception of what is now known in anthropological writing as *mana*, a diffused power latent in every possible kind of object. Then there is ancestor-worship, by far the most significant element in African religion. This belief in spirits, which includes both human and non-human, may gradually acquire a fuller religious content, and become sublimated into a belief in a Supreme Being, sometimes personal but more often impersonal—on the whole, in Africa, a rather absentee Deity, whose powers are effectively exercised by lesser gods and spirits. His occasional manifestations are usually of a kindly character, and occur when the human situation is not adequately supervised by the lesser deities. The book is marked by a genuine desire not to go beyond the evidence, and reveals a liberal attitude on the part of the writers towards the indigenous beliefs which they so carefully describe.

Were You There? (Epworth Press; 3s. 6d. net), by the Rev. Allen Birtwhistle, M.A., B.Sc., consists of four meditations on the theme of Easter. It is an unusual kind of compilation. In each chapter a question is presented through a story or an event; then follow a brief account of the life of a great English Christian (Gilbert, Ridley, Bede, Tyndale, in succession), an act of devotion, and a development of the theme. Obviously it is not so much a book to be read as a book to be used in a church (Methodist) service. The author used its material at a Young People's Conference. An appendix consists of Bible Study Notes on the Cross, being in expanded form a Course followed by Cambridge University students in preparation for an evangelical campaign.

This revised edition of *An ABC of Psychology*, by Professor Eric S. Waterhouse, M.A., D.D., D.Lit. (Epworth Press; 5s. net), which has already been reprinted five times, is intended mainly for Sunday School Teachers and Bible Students, and will be a useful introduction to the study of more complete books. The author says that it is 'hard to be simple without being shallow,' but he has succeeded in his aim and has avoided the associated danger. The concluding chapter on 'Jesus as a Teacher' is admirable, and illustrates the truth that one chief aspect of the Incarnation was a profound understanding of human nature.

Dr. James Black's last volume of sermons has just been published by Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton. The title is *Days of My Autumn* (8s. 6d. net). Although ill, Dr. Black was able to prepare the volume for press and he wrote the Preface in which he says that the sermons were chosen by hearers for 'I am one of those luckless people who never can judge the worth or worthlessness of their own work.' He adds, 'I am comforted by the thought that in the long run the best, perhaps the only test of a sermon is the impression it makes on a hearer's mind and memory.'

Dr. Black had a field of his own as a preacher and the twenty-two sermons which form this volume are marked by characteristically careful expositions of the texts, are clear in thought and are directed to the one end—that his hearers should have a living and deep faith in God.

We have quoted one of the sermons, in slightly shortened form, in 'The Christian Year.' The choice was not easy, but the one selected shows particularly well Dr. Black's outstanding gift of making the Bible story vivid.

St. Ambrose on the Sacraments and on the Mysteries (S.P.C.K.; 10s. 6d. net), translated by the Rev. T. Thompson, B.D., was originally published in 1919 under the editorship of Dr. J. H. Srawley with the title, 'St. Ambrose On the Mysteries and the Treatise On the Sacraments by an Unknown Author.' But Dr. Srawley is now of opinion that both treatises are the work of St. Ambrose, and in this new edition (justified by their importance for the history of worship in the Western Church) he supports that opinion and seeks also to bring out their mutual relationship. Mr. Thompson's translation has been retained with a few necessary emendations, and some notes left by him have been included. Dr. Srawley has himself supplied the most of the scholarly Notes as well as the Introduction. It is a work to be commended to the student of Christian worship.

The Spiritual Exercises of Saint Ignatius of Loyola (Mowbray; 16s. net) is a translation from the Spanish of an important and influential book on the spiritual life. The translation is by the late Rev. W. H. Longridge, of the Society of St. John the Evangelist, who also supplies a commentary, some longer Additional Notes, and a translation of the *Directorium in Exercitia*. First published in 1919, the book reached a second edition in 1922 and a third in 1930. This is the fourth edition, and presumably it is an exact reproduction of the third, in which as in the second a few corrections and changes were made upon the first. Mr. Longridge appears to be still recognized, many years

after his death, by Anglican and Roman Catholic scholars alike, as one of the highest authorities on the works of St. Ignatius of Loyola. The 'Spiritual Exercises' are intended primarily for use in times of retreat and consist in the first place of meditations, contemplations, examinations of conscience, and other methods of prayer; in the second place, of counsels and instructions explaining how the general course of the retreat is to be adapted to various classes of persons or to individuals. The 'Directory to the Spiritual Exercises,' which is appended to the volume in a translation from the Latin, is an official body of instructions drawn up for those who give the 'Exercises' to others. It was first published in 1591, some fifty years after Ignatius had composed the 'Exercises,' and reached its final edition in 1599.

In attempting to estimate a book of this kind—*World Invisible*, by Miss Dallas Kenmare (Williams and Norgate; 8s. 6d. net)—the ordinary critic is rather non-suited by the assertion that much of its contents will be unintelligible to the 'average' man. But one can only hope that the number of those able to appreciate its beauty and spiritual insight will be much greater than Miss Kenmare expects. Her deep-seated regret is that 'in the materialistic realm there is too much blind faith; in the realm of the Spirit hardly any faith at all,' but her book should do much to create or deepen faith in those who are fortunate enough to read it. With some of the arguments they will profoundly disagree, but they will follow with deep interest the analysis of personality, which is said to be so elusive that introspection is insufficient and a person can unlock the mystery of his being only through outward relationship moved by the spirit of love, the supreme amongst the attributes of God. Indeed, the author comes very near to Lotze's principle that 'complete personality can only be in God while to man can belong but a weak and faint copy thereof.' She is favourable to the doctrine of several planes of being, and pays a tribute to Eastern philosophy's fuller appreciation of this. She holds that in the course of the individual life personality must develop through many changing phases, and that failure to realize this, along with the tendency to narrow love to attraction between the sexes, is the explanation of many difficulties in the marriage relationship. The chapter on 'The Personality of the Artist' is an excellent piece of work, especially the treatment of Shelley and D. H. Lawrence, and her exposition of freedom in relation to personality is both illuminating and inspiring. As already hinted, she is much influenced by Eastern philosophers, but is more positive than they are, and emphasises differences rather than identity. Her hope for the future of society might be summed up in her quotation from Schweitzer, 'The only conceivable way of bringing about a reconstruction of our world on new lines is first of all to become new men ourselves under the old circumstances.'

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Amo.

By the Reverend Charles M. Hepburn, B.D., Crieff.

'The greatest of these is love.'—1 Co 13[13] (R.V.)

One of the attractions of St. Giles' Cathedral in Edinburgh is the famous Thistle Chapel, where those noblemen who are elected Knights of the Thistle gather from time to time. Over their chairs or stalls are the knights' coats-of-arms with their mottoes above or underneath. For example, Admiral Viscount Cunningham of Hyndhope has a strange motto, 'Over, Fork Over.' Beneath the coat-of-arms of the Bonnie House of Airlie again is a French one, 'À Fin,' which means 'On to the End.' But under the shield of that distinguished nobleman, the Duke of Buccleuch, is a very small one, a Latin word of only three letters. It was, I should think, the first Latin verb many of you learned, 'Amo,' which means 'I love.' Nor could you and I choose a better motto, for love should be first and last and always. 'God is love,' Jesus said. Jesus also loved, as nobody else ever loved. Again the Apostle Paul said of the things that abide that 'the greatest of these is love.' So let's consider what is included in love.

Love then, for one thing, should include obedience. Once when a Scotch lad was leaving home for a post far away, his mother said:

'Robert, promise me something.'

Not knowing what it was he hesitated, so she said:

'Robert, you know that I wouldn't ask you for anything that wasn't right.'

Because, then, he trusted his mother he promised, and she asked him to read a portion of the Bible

every morning and every night. And Robert obeyed and fulfilled love's promise, and was later on a great missionary, Robert Moffat, who took the gospel to the native peoples of South Africa.

If, then, we love our fathers and mothers we will want to obey them too. And if we love Jesus we will give Him also our glad obedience. Isn't that, for example, the meaning of what we sing in one of our hymns

> Love in loving finds employ,
> In obedience all her joy?

Secondly, now, love must surely include 'preferring,' or putting others first. A doctor went off to town one day saying he would bring his two small girls a doll apiece, but when he got home they found, alas, he'd forgotten. One burst into tears, but her sister said with a resolute air, 'I don't mind. I would rather have my Daddy than my dolly.' She was practising that lesson of putting first and foremost the one she loved.

It brings to mind something Jesus said, 'Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these?' So true love to Jesus means preferring Him, just putting Him before everything else.

And, lastly, love should include enduring loyalty. On the corner of an Edinburgh street, not very far indeed from St. Giles' Cathedral, there is a metal statuette of Greyfriars Bobby. Greyfriars Bobby was a dog, who, when his master died, followed his coffin to the graveyard at Greyfriars Church. And year after year, as long as he lived, he refused to go away from it: he guarded the spot where his master rested. Only a dog, a mere dumb animal, it may be said. But surely 'Amo' was Bobby's motto. May our love to our Master be as loyal as that.

The Story of Any Shepherd.

By the Reverend N. H. G. Robinson, D.Litt., Rothesay.

'What man of you, having an hundred sheep . . . ?'
—Lk 15[4].

Some time ago I came across a dog which had been given a name taken from the Bible. It was called Naomi. It was only a puppy, but large and white, being a Samoyed; and quite recently Naomi had an adventure which fell out in much the same way as a well-known Bible story.

Naomi had a good home. She was well cared for and well fed and was perfectly happy; but one day Naomi discovered a hole in the hedge of her master's garden and she slipped away to explore the surrounding town. Very soon she was completely lost. When her absence was discovered at home, however, every one was greatly upset. Already it was getting late but the younger members of the family set off in search of their pet. For an hour and more they looked in this direction and that, but in the end they had to return home unsuccessful. Then Naomi's master set out and with longer, quicker steps covered a much larger part of the town; but still Naomi was not to be found. Then some neighbours, who liked Naomi, went for a midnight stroll with ears and eyes alert; but they too failed to find her. In the middle of the night her master was wakened by a bark and went to the garden to investigate; but it was a false alarm and Naomi was still missing. Next morning her master went out to call at the Police Station and to inquire whether perhaps Naomi was there; but on his way, turning a corner from one street to another, he spied the dog, dirty now and tired, and very soon Naomi was home. You can guess how pleased all the family were, for you know how pleased you would have been if it had been your dog. Every one was so pleased that they went and told their neighbours and their friends, as you also might have done. And then when it was all over Naomi's master suddenly realized that they had all behaved just as Jesus once said they would. You remember when He said it or something very like it? 'What man of you, having an hundred sheep, if he lose one of them, doth not . . . go after that which is lost, until he find it? And when he hath found it, he layeth it on his shoulders, rejoicing. And when he cometh home, he calleth together his friends and neighbours, saying unto them, Rejoice with me; for I have found my sheep which was lost.'

It is the Parable of the Lost Sheep, of course. That at any rate is its correct title; but sometimes boys and girls and even grown-up people who allow themselves to become a little confused talk of it as the Parable of the Good Shepherd. And yet it is not that at all. It is not a story about a *good* shepherd; it is a story about any shepherd, about every shepherd who is worth his salt. 'What man of you, having an hundred sheep . . . ?' It is not a story about specially good people; it is a simple tale of people like you and me and ordinary folk like Naomi's master and an average shepherd long ago.

But why did Jesus take the trouble to tell a parable about such ordinary people, about people like you and me? Well, He had a very good reason. It was to teach us a lesson we should never forget. It was to show us in a simple but impressive and unforgettable way the manner in which God treats us who are His children. For if you and I, being perfectly ordinary people, can take so much trouble and worry over a dog, a dumb animal which cannot even speak to us, how much more is God concerned when we forsake Him

and despise His company and His house which is our home! And if you and I can go to such lengths to find the dog or the sheep that is lost, how much more God must do to bring *us* back whom He has called His children! How much more He has already done by sending Jesus His Son into the world! And if we can be so greatly pleased by the return of our pets, how much greater is the joy in heaven, how much warmer the welcome when you and I return to God's fold! If we, being ordinary people, can do so much, how much more does God do, who is perfectly good and who loves us with a perfect love!

Prayer for Our Threatened World.

Eternal God, we, who have seen,
in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye,
the very elements dissolve in fervent heat,
and life perish in atomic blast;
we, who have learnt afresh
that in the material world is no security,
would turn anew to Thee
in whom alone our souls can find salvation,
and base all our trust in Thee,
who wast and art and evermore shall be.

Most merciful God,
we confess that we and all men
have sought knowledge and power more than virtue and love,
and so are unfit to use rightly
the mastery we have won over Nature.
O God, in Thy compassion,
grant us yet a space to repent.
Avert from us the consequences of folly,
Forbid that we have to eat all the fruits
of pride and greed and hate.
Teach us how in brotherhood with all men
we may make new knowledge a blessing.

O God whose righteousness is like the great mountains,
in this sinful world,
give us patience and meekness to endure wrong
without avenging ourselves;
and courage to use our strength
to bring succour to the helpless;
and wisdom to discern the right way.
And as we pray thus, each for himself,
so we pray for the nations,
that they may be kept in paths of honour,
and maintain justice and freedom and peace.
And to God, the Father, Son and Holy Spirit
be glory, world without end.

AMEN.

The Christian Year.

SEVENTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Cyrus at the Gate.

'In that night was Belshazzar the king of the Chaldeans slain. And Darius the Median took the kingdom, being about threescore and two years old.'—Dn $5^{30f.}$

The dramatic story of Belshazzar's feast is founded on popular history that cannot now be verified. The popular history, however, has the definite support of Herodotus the historian and Zenophon the Greek recorder, both of whom assert that Babylon was stormed by the Medes and Persians in a sudden night attack, while Belshazzar (the son of King Nabonidus, the last King of glorious Babylon) was feasting riotously, without any proper guard or watch.

Moreover, certain cuneiform inscriptions seem to support the general story. Rawlinson, for instance, translates this prayer of Nabonidus: 'As for Belsarra-usur, the exalted son, the off-spring of my body, do thou cause the adoration of thy great divinity to exist in his heart; may he not give way to sin: may he be satisfied with life's abundance.' This anxious prayer suggests the whole background of Daniel's picture.

Nabonidus, the real King, was a quiet, unwarlike man. From weakness or preoccupation in his own pursuits, he seems to have resigned the active rule of the Empire to Belshazzar, who acted as his General and Viceregent. This explains why, in various places, Belshazzar is called the 'King.' For if not King in fact, he was King in effect.

If the famous Nebuchadnezzar (Belshazzar is sometimes called his 'son,' but that means only 'heir') was the emblem of pride and haughty self-will, this descendant of his, Belshazzar, was the emblem of impiety and profanity.

Here is the dramatic story.

This ancient empire, which had lasted for centuries and had given the world most of its civilization, had grown slack and careless, and was now threatened by the young fierce Persians from the hills. Darius (or Cyrus), the Persian leader, must have had little real hope of conquering Babylon, the greatest power of the known world. But he found that the rulers of the city were his unconscious allies: for they took his challenge too lightly and committed the worst military blunder, despising their enemy and being foolishly over-confident. (Perhaps some of us to-day had better take note!)

According to the story, the violent and reckless Belshazzar was so foolishly confident that even while the Persians were digging themselves in around the city, he arranged a defiant feast to

show his contempt of Cyrus and his hordes. Then when the wine had driven any sense or balance from his mind, he suddenly remembered the cups of the Holy Temple. 'Bring me the temple vessels,' he cried, 'and I'll drink damnation to the Persians out of them.'

Now comes the touch of drama.

In their drunken orgy some one cried out in superstitious terror, 'Look! Look, my Lord! Behind you, my Lord.' And there on the wall at the back of Belshazzar's royal chair, some one had scrawled in chalk or coloured pencil these mysterious words, '*Mene, Mene, Tekel, Upharsin.*' Some in their terror swore that they actually saw a ghostly hand writing the letters. Be that as it may, all could now see the scrawled words chalked on the wall. What did the printed letters mean? No one could tell, not even their official soothsayers and magicians. At some man's suggestion they sent for Daniel to interpret the awesome words.

'You ask me, Sir, what these words mean? Too well I know. Even as I left the walls on the north side, I saw crowds of Persian warriors already scaling the ramparts. What do the words mean? I'll tell you. It means that you and all Babylon are doomed, self-doomed in your own debauch and godless licence. *Mene, Mene*—your lustful day is finished: it is now numbered and ended. *Tekel*—you are weighed in the scales, and your decrepit people in the balances. *Upharsin*—God, who cannot be mocked, has divided your ancient empire and thrown it in pieces to the Persians. . . . My Lord, the Persians are even now in the streets, and Cyrus is through your gates.'

To-day there are hordes knocking at our doors. Must our Western civilization crack or go under?

The supreme question that should concern us to-day, us and our civilization is—*Do nations and civilizations naturally grow old and decrepit like individual men and women?*

The answer is *Yes!* and *No!*

It is Yes in this double sense. (*a*) On the one hand, history is strewn with the relics of once great and virile civilizations that have worn out like old clothes and can now be patched together only by the ingenuity of archæologists—Babylon, Assyria, Ancient China, Egypt, Greece, Carthage, and Rome, now mere memories of a former greatness. (*b*) On the other hand, it is also as fully proved that ease, licence, and presumption can sap virility from a great people and make them effete.

So I say, Yes. Nations can and do become decrepit. Where *national character* has been eaten away by the slow acids of ease and indulgence (character, the only thing that really matters, character that is like the stiffening of steel)—then, alas, nations and peoples can sell themselves and their destiny. We have seen it happen again and again.

But equally I say, *No.* Neither people nor culture need ever grow old, like a decrepit man. Why? *Because a nation is being constantly recruited by fresh, young, and quick life!*

It is worth remembering that the tone of a people is not made by its middle-aged or old people: it is made (or unmade) by its young. The blame of degeneration may lie with the example of the old, or with the life and education they provide. But the vigour of a people's outlook depends entirely on its youth. Hitler knew this (it was part of his evil genius)—for he paid no regard to people over forty, except to silence them or push them into concentration camps, but he spent all his time and influence in twisting the young twigs for his own ends, bending them in crookedness and shame. . . . The youth of a land means everything, its reproach or its pride. If only the young men and women are keen, quick and strong in God, no nation need ever grow old or decrepit.

What are the virtues that may preserve any people or culture?

The answer is plain—*only the original strong virtues that first made the people and the civilizations great!* These are: (1) *Faith,* faith in something, faith in anything, so long as it has idealism and passion in its heart—most of all, faith in God, who calls for a strong and clean life, and faith in themselves and their own quality and destiny. Foolish people often ask, 'Does it matter what we believe, or whether we believe at all?' History gives the final answer: for it is just the record of man's faith, faith that has moved mountains, faith that is the spur of adventure, and the parent of dreams.

(2) *The power of discipline, and if need be, sacrifice, which a fine faith inspires.* Because we believe certain things to be bigger than ourselves, we learn to master and control our powers, and especially to cut out cancerous licence. I remember being puzzled in my first battalion with the odd fact that some of the men who had been 'wastrels' in civil life proved to be among our best soldiers. I talked this over with one of our captains, and he (an old 'regular') smiled and said, 'It is dead easy, Padre. These lads were good stuff wasted: and now for the first time they are braced by discipline.' He was right! No man, no nation, no culture that lives soft or refuses restraint and reverence can endure for long. This is why our Christian faith, which is real and living, always makes men heroes: for its people hear this call, 'If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me.'

(3) *The belief that what we are and do matters*

significantly and that our acts and ways are eternally decisive. This is not egoism, but the common-sense of our faith, giving meaning, direction and fine seriousness to all constructive living. If we believe that we matter to God (so much so that only a cross can express it)—and that our personal conduct is important and perhaps critical for the well-being of the world, we shall live at our best and shall keep the great values clear. In my very marrow, I know that there is one supreme sin—to say or think that I don't count, and that whatever I am or do, it will be all the same a hundred years hence! But history, either for singing or sorrow, has been made by the acts of individual men—in our own day, by a bullet at Sarajevo or by the whim of a former house-painter! It is only blue ruin for any man to think that his good or evil matters nothing for the welfare of the world.

How do peoples and empires and civilizations fall? They crack by their own inner decay—by indulgence, impiety, profanity, and the sacrifice of the great virtues of faith, endurance, honour, and responsibility. Cyrus doesn't conquer Babylon: Babylon first conquers itself. When the lower appetites and hankerings poison a nation's soul, that nation falls because it has lost itself. Then, though we may not see it at the moment, there is that scrawled handwriting on the wall—*Mene, Mene, Tekel, Upharsin.* That may not seem to matter desperately while the land is quiet and the sun shines. But what if Cyrus be at the gates?

I wonder if Cyrus is at the gates now? [1]

EIGHTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

God's Care and Ours.

BY THE REVEREND PRINCIPAL CHARLES S. DUTHIE, B.D., EDINBURGH.

'For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.'—Jn 3^{16}.

There is a degree of justice in the charge that Christians and especially Christian preachers have grown too fond of analysing the problems and diagnosing the maladies of the modern world. Our finger is too often upon the pulse of our age. Quite certainly it is our Christian business to know what is ailing. Only as we understand the sickness of our civilization are we able to bring the gospel with convincing and converting power to bear upon contemporary life. But the danger of diagnosing too much and too often is that we may be mesmerized by the sheer mass of evil that is in the world. When we view the Christian task in all its paralysing bigness and then consider the seemingly pitiful resources of which the Church disposes, we begin to wonder whether very much can be done to remedy matters. It is only one step further to a mood of secret or open hopelessness.

It is therefore good for us Christians, not once but often, to reverse the common order of our thinking: to start not with our Christian responsibilities but with our Christian assets, to begin not with the situation and what it demands of us *but with what Christianity gives to us that enables the Church to face any situation, and therefore the present situation.*

Now what *is* the thing in Christianity that gives the Church the power to look at an unredeemed world, with all the disturbing elements of evil in it, without losing faith and hope? That question can be put in another way. What is it that links the Church of to-day with the Church of the Reformation and the Church of the apostles? The thing of transcendent importance that comes to the Church out of the Christian past is the gospel, the Christian message, the astounding good news that God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son. *God cares. He cares for each of us. He cares for all of us. He will go on caring for ever.* And how do we know that He cares? Because He Himself has told us so, in the most compelling language of all, the language of a human life. A girl on looking back to the time when she first met her lover recognizes it as the beginning of a new life. 'It was then,' she will say simply, 'that he came into my life.' We know that God cares because He came into our life in Jesus Christ, laying Himself alongside us and taking upon His own heart our weakness and sin. This is the heart of our gospel, and it is here that more and more we ought to begin.

During the past fifty years we have witnessed a remarkable development in our understanding of the range and relevance of this gospel. Our fathers believed very vehemently that God cares for the individual soul. I trust we share something of their passion. But we have come to see, as they perhaps could not see, that from the beginning of his life this individual is part of an order of society, a pattern of communal living, by which inevitably he is shaped to good or evil. He is a member of various groups—the school, the family, the trade union, the Church, the nation; and each of these leaves its impress on him. We rightly conclude that the God who is concerned about the redemption of the individual is also concerned about the redemption of the setting in which he lives. Christianity is a circle whose circumference touches everything that has to do with people. The gospel bears upon the state of slums in Glasgow and the treatment meted out to

[1] James Black, *Days of My Autumn*, 11.

natives in South Africa. At this point, however, we must watch where we are going. *The improvement of the structure of human society must always be carried out for the sake of individual persons and the fruitful relationships in which they may stand to each other.* Professor Brunner does well to remind us that in our rightful concern for the betterment of the social order we ought not to forget that a day will come when all social orders will have vanished. In that day, God and the human soul, God and you, God and I will still remain. To make a junction between God and the soul is thus the first task of the Church. The Christian circle that has a circumference has also a centre. That centre is Christ, for we only have a great gospel because we have a great Christ at the heart of it. And so the junction between God and the soul is effected when it is brought home to the heart of the individual that it is in this Jesus that God the gracious Father comes to seek and to find and to claim him as His own.

> It reacheth me, it reacheth me
> Wondrous grace, it reacheth me
> Pure, exhaustless, ever-flowing,
> Wondrous grace, it reacheth me.

God cares. That is the good news we have to tell the world. But how can we share it with the man of to-day so that it alters his entire way of thinking and living ? How can we show him that Christianity is quite literally the biggest thing in the world and that if he misses it he is never, never going to find an adequate substitute for it ? There are at least two things we must do. First, *we must face the full difficulty of our task and seek from God the strength with which to fulfil it.* In this propaganda-ridden age we speak much of 'getting the gospel over to people.' And we come to assume, almost, that the major part of the Christian task of evangelism is that of getting people to understand what the gospel is. Our campaigners on the large Commando teams found it otherwise. Using every wise method available to them and talking the language of the people they were astonished at first by the genuine interest shown in personal religion in the shops and factories they visited. Men and women remained for hours to talk about God. There seemed to be—and there probably was—a real hunger for God. But as they went on they saw that it is one thing to interest men in Jesus Christ and quite another to win their allegiance to Him. We have not only to get the gospel over to people. We have to get it into people ; and this demands all the wisdom, the courage, the perseverance, and the love that by the grace of God we can muster. If I am tempted to think that I am doing enough to bring Christ to my fellows, I go back in thought to my grandfather, a fisherman who knew something of the ways of God in the great deep but more of His ways in the deeps of the human soul. When any one was in distress of mind or spirit he would rise in the middle of the night and pray with the whole strength of body and soul until he had reached some new level of insight or power which would enable him to give the help that was needed. Souls are not re-born without pain. If we sincerely desire to lead men into the Kingdom of God, we must be prepared to enter into the redemptive agony of our Lord.

That suggests the second thing we must do. *We must gain a fresh perspective which will show us just how the care of God is communicated to those who know nothing of it.* Generally, we see our situation like this. We are inside the Church with the gospel. Outside the Church are those who have not felt the power of the gospel. Somehow we must go out to them with our gospel and having won them bring them back within the Church. But this is far from being a complete picture. To the man outside the Church the gospel is more or less an unknown quantity. Christianity for him means the Church and the people who represent it. The gospel walks into his life in the form of John Smith of St. Andrew's Church who works by his side in the mill. If the care of God, which is the theme of the gospel, is going to lay hold of him, it must do so through the Christian fellowship and its members. John Smith must be a bit of the good news in his own person. What a challenge this is to the Church ! After one look at the Church, people around us ought to be saying 'Here are people with something so immensely worthwhile that we must find out more about it.' Do they say this about our Church and about us ? During Passchendaele in the first World War, when many hearts were heavy with sorrow and many hearts heavy with foreboding, some one thought it would be helpful to expose to the city of Glasgow the great affirmations of Scripture—'God so loved the world' ; 'Let not your hearts be troubled,' and so on. A parade of sandwich-boardmen tramped through the city. An old Highland minister saw them marching. Unfortunately they had been compelled to bring out the old, the lame, and the blind. 'I could not see the mighty words of the gospel,' he said, 'for looking at the wretched sandwich-boardmen who carried them.' Is it sometimes like that with us ? The Apostle Paul had grasped very firmly the great truth that it is through people that God touches other people. In writing to the Romans about his long-delayed visit, he says, 'I am sure that, when I come unto you, I shall come in the fullness of the blessing of the gospel of Christ.' The true Christian not only carries the gospel of God's care

for others *with* him. He carries it *within* him, in the quality of his concern and compassion, in his willingness to give and to serve.

God cares for men. But it is His will that they should discover how much He cares by seeing how much we care. And the secret of such caring for us who find it so hard to love? The secret surely lies in pausing to rediscover the gospel for ourselves. When our hearts are filled with amazement at the love with which God has loved us in Christ and that love is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit who is given to us, we see men and women with new eyes. By the miracle which awes and humbles us, God's care has become our care.

NINETEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Consecration of Mind.

BY THE REVEREND T. TUDOR RHYS, B.A., B.D., HINCKLEY.

'My son, give me thine heart.'—Pr 23^{26}.

You might think that the Bible is the most sentimental book in the world. The two related Hebrew words for 'heart' occur eight hundred and fifty-one times and in the New Testament St. Paul uses the Greek equivalent no fewer than fifty-two times. But when, in the Bible, God is said to ask man for his 'heart' He asks for the consecration of memory, of conscience, of the emotions—in fact, of the mind and of all that is in the mind of man—'those thoughts that wander through eternity,' and those thoughts 'that do often lie too deep for tears.'

But why should the mind be consecrated? A lover of pictures was showing his friend his collection of paintings. He pointed to an undoubted Botticelli, but with this reservation: 'When I say "undoubted," I mean that the two heads must have been painted in by Botticelli whatever member of his school painted the rest of the canvas.' If the head is the most important part of an angel then the mind is a most important part of a man.

But can we be more precise? Why should God say to man: 'My son, give me thine heart?' In other words: Why should God ask for the control of the human mind? Why should our thoughts be consecrated? The answer can be given under three headings.

1. *Man has his Source outside himself. God wants to be recognized at the Starting Places.* Man is a creature; his beginnings lie beyond himself.

> O Power Supreme!
> Without Whose call this world would cease to breathe,
> Who from the Fountain of Thy grace dost fill
> The veins that branch through every frame of life,
> Making man what he is, creature divine,
> In single or in social eminence,
> Above the rest raised infinite ascents
> When reason that enables him to be
> Is not sequestered.

What Wordsworth is saying here is that it is only from the point of view of the One beyond man that man himself can be understood and it is only from the standpoint of the eternal world that this world can be made intelligible. That is why, when man puts his mind to anything, God wants to be there at the start.

Everything starts in thought. 'First I think,' said the child, 'then I draw my think'—that is Art. So we can go on. 'First I think, then I build my think'—that is Architecture. 'Then I act my think'—that is Drama. 'Then I sing my think'—that is Music. 'Then I live my think'—that is Character. 'Then I become my think'—that is Destiny.

That is true in the good sense—'a good man out of the good treasure of the heart bringeth forth good things.' 'Thou didst well,' said the Lord to David, of his good intentions, 'that it was in thine heart.' But it is also true in the bad sense. Many a duodenal ulcer is a materialized worry. What happens in an unconsecrated mind is that God is not recognized at the starting-place —'the devil put into the heart of Judas to betray him.' And it was the worst that happened. God wants to 'get there first'—to come between the man and the worst, so that the best can take root and grow. A consecrated mind, on the other hand, recognizes God at the starting-point and God 'gets there first.' When Sir William Orpen painted a portrait of Archbishop Lang he made him look like 'a proud prelate.' A friend's comment was: 'That is what the devil meant him to be, but thanks be to God, it is not so.' Lang's mind was not 'sequestered'; it had been consecrated to God.

2. *Man finds a Centre outside himself. God wants to be acknowledged in the Scattering Places.* Man has a wonderful gift, not shared, so far as we know, by any other creature—the gift of looking at himself as if he were looking at somebody else. He has the power of contemplating the world from a centre outside himself. What possibilities, urgent and practical, this opens out! Man can 'set his mind' deliberately to the task of destroying himself and his world. Indeed, he is already considering the problem and imagining the possibilities.

There is a point at which thoughts meet and from which they radiate in all directions. Thought is a creative force. Professor Anderson of Yale University has conducted experiments to prove

that a student thinking out a mathematical problem weighs more than he does when he is not thinking about anything in particular! Thoughts are 'things' and they have weight. Professor J. B. Rhine of Duke University, Carolina, has shown that the power of thought can influence and determine the throw of a dice. In his *Autobiography* John Cowper Powys says that, when he was ill at the London Hospital, he used to project his thoughts upon the other patients to cheer them up and to make them better. 'I invented the trick,' he says, 'of concentrating my mind on variously coloured angels. I directed the attention of one set of coloured angels, purple ones, let us say, to one sufferer, and those of another colour —to another sufferer. In this way, as I lay in this great White Ship of Suffering, I felt I was not altogether wasting my time.'

Our Lord says 'love your enemies.' That is not Eros but Agape, not physical but mental—a disposing of the mind and a directing of the will towards goodness. You can make a man worse by thinking ill of him. But you can also help to make him better. A consecrated mind is a mind whose thoughts are harnessed to the power of God, the mind of a man who has let God in at the Scattering Centre from which all thoughts radiate.

3. *Man needs a Saviour outside himself. God wants us to Surrender to Him in the Secret Places.* Man is really what he is in the secret places of his thoughts. The real man is what he is when he is alone. Jesus said to the Pharisees 'but God knoweth your hearts.'

And what do we find when we search ourselves in the secret places? We find, for one thing, that it is there that the trouble lies. The modern French dramatist, de Montherlant, is only one of many who to-day are expressing the sense of loneliness of the human soul in an alien world. 'Wretched, O, wretched,' cries one of his characters, 'not to be encaged, but to believe oneself to be.' In other words, the problem lies in oneself, and help must come from outside.

In the eighth book of his *Confessions* Augustine describes what goes on in the secret places of the soul. When Mind commands the Body, he says, the Body always obeys at once. The Mind says to the hand: 'Reach this,' and the thing's done. The Mind says to the mouth: 'Say that,' and the word is out. But when Mind commands Mind very often nothing happens at all. It is because the Mind is divided against itself.

A consecrated mind is the mind of the man who acknowledges the strange truth that the only freedom a man has is the freedom to choose his own master. In other words: man needs outside help. The truth is that it is not against himself merely that a man is divided but against the One who is his Source, his Centre, and his Saviour. And to-day once more He is saying to man, only this time He is saying it through our Saviour: 'My son, give me thine heart.'

TWENTIETH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Two Attitudes to Life.

BY THE REVEREND RODERICK BETHUNE, M.A., EDINBURGH.

'And Jacob their father said unto them, Me have ye bereaved of my children: Joseph is not, and Simeon is not, and ye will take Benjamin away: all these things are against me.'—Gn 42^{36}.

'And now, behold, I go bound in the spirit unto Jerusalem, not knowing the things that shall befall me there: Save that the Holy Ghost witnesseth in every city, saying that bonds and afflictions abide me. But none of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy, and the ministry, which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God.'—Ac 20^{22-24}.

These verses reveal Jacob and Paul at critical hours in their lives. Which of them faced the greater trial it is difficult at this distance to say.

But if there seems little to choose between the two situations, a wide gulf separates the attitudes of the two men towards their difficulties. Jacob, persuaded that more has been laid upon him than he can bear, says, 'all these things are against me,' and suggests that life had come near to breaking his spirit. Paul, on the other hand, sensitive to the fact that he had been hurt undeservedly, and aware that the prophecies of what awaits him at Jerusalem may well be fulfilled, faces the situation with enviable valour. 'None of these things,' he says, 'move me.'

Those two attitudes to difficulties exist side by side to-day. We live in times that are far from easy, and many endure suffering as great as any ever appointed to men to bear. Some, contemplating the world situation, are not only apprehensive but wholly dispirited; while others, observing that same situation, and equally aware as their neighbours of how menacing it is, succeed in keeping their courage intact. Some upon whom personal sorrows have come have lost heart and are tempted to give up a struggle that seems so unequal; while others, passing through as fierce fires of affliction, refuse to acknowledge defeat.

Since we are all involved in the world situation, and since to us, too, sorrow must come, if it has not already come, one question keeps pressing for an answer. Wherein does the secret of the braver attitude to life's difficulties lie?

1. Some suggest that it lies in the fact that there are difficulties and difficulties and that all

men are not equally sensitive to pain and sorrow and loss.

Similar as the positions of Jacob and Paul appear to be, they remind us, closer analysis reveals essential differences. Jacob was an old man, while Paul, if no longer to be reckoned young, was considerably his junior. Burdens which can be carried courageously at one stage in life are a different proposition at a later stage when one is less vigorous, less resilient. Furthermore, Jacob was a parent, bound by the tenderest of human ties to his children, while Paul, without family responsibilities, without even a home to maintain, had only himself to consider.

Such statements, let us admit, have point. There are difficulties and difficulties. We know that from our own experience. We have found it possible to face some almost nonchalantly, while others have shaken our wonted confidence. And as for the suggestion that men are not equally sensitive to pain and sorrow and loss, we admit that it, also, has point. A bereavement which leaves one home desolate leaves another home, so far as we can judge, unmoved.

And yet, having made such admissions, it is obvious to all of us that the whole truth concerning the braver attitude to life does not lie here. We have seen aged people undergo as searching experiences as ever befell their younger neighbours and bear themselves more courageously. We have known men and women who were as sensitive to pain and loss as it is possible to be who, under the most crushing of loads, carried their heads high.

2. Others, coming nearer the mark, attribute the braver attitude to will-power, to sheer grit, to a spirit that refuses to acknowledge defeat. Paul, they remind us, was a man of iron will, of inflexible resolve.

There can be no doubt that will-power does make a difference. As a nation we shall always remember the debt we owe to one who, when we stood in imminent peril and it seemed to many only a matter of time until we and all that we held dear were overwhelmed, rallied us by his eloquence and his will to win. His confidence was infectious. Men who had resigned themselves to a fate that seemed inevitable began to share their leader's determination.

What we have seen happen in the case of a nation have we not witnessed in the case of an individual? Recently I read the autobiography of a young South African, Murrough de Nesbit, which left me deeply moved. As a lad, full of the joy of life, he played games, he rode, he climbed, he swam. At the age of thirteen he lost both legs in a railway accident. His friends, anticipating with regret the limited life now open to him, pitied him, and, at the beginning, he pitied himself. Then, one night, in the dimness of a hospital ward, when sleep refused to come, he prayed as brave a prayer as any I have read or heard. 'God,' he said, 'don't let this conquer my mind.' And there and then he sought, by contributing his own will-power, to aid God to answer his request. In time he acquired artificial limbs and, incredible as it may seem, he not only walks and rides, but, discarding his limbs, he swims, and he dives from seventy-five feet. Having overcome his own handicap, he has, with the help of friends, established a colony to which all who are handicapped and feel that life for them is ended are invited to come that he may inspire them to make an effort comparable to his own.

Yet, admitting the contribution that will-power has made to, and the part it has played in, countless lives, is it true to say that in will-power lies the whole secret of the braver attitude to life? For myself, I feel that that is not true. There are sorrows, I am sure, which cannot be borne in the strength of will-power alone. I am equally sure that there are cases of men and women passing through some Gethsemane in which it would be an impertinence to say that they must show more grit. Moreover, the picture which Paul's words conjure up in one's mind is not that of a man who has set his teeth and is resolved to make the most of things.

3. Where, then, does the secret of the braver attitude to life lie? Is it not in the faith by which a man is inspired, in the faith which Jesus inspires in all who have contact with Him?

'None of these things move me,' said Paul, 'neither count I my life dear unto myself.' Why? 'So,' he continued, 'that I might finish my course with joy, and the ministry, which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God.' Quite clearly, he believed that God had a plan for him. In the course of things, sorrow as well as joy might be encountered, but God could make the sorrow as well as the joy contribute to His gracious purpose. Believing that, Paul, while acknowledging that the hardness of the roads appointed him was beyond his power to explain, bore his sufferings courageously, sure that what was meantime hidden from his sight would some day be revealed. And what he believed concerning his own life he encouraged others to believe about theirs, and in so doing proclaimed the message which the New Testament proclaims from beginning to end.

Some, I know, professing to have read this particular message of the New Testament, dismiss it, in a superior kind of way, as simply a faith. But don't all men live by some faith, if not by the Christian faith then by another? Some people, says Monsignor Ronald Knox in one of his

books, have 'got the idea that the less you believe the more clever and the more enlightened you must be.' But that, he continues, 'comes from looking at the thing in quite the wrong way. The difference between being a credulous person and being a sensible person is not a question of how many things you believe; it is a question of whether you believe the right things.' Well, who does believe the right things—he who accepts the New Testament message or he who dismisses it and believes something else? What is the alternative to the Christian faith? Surely that there is no over-ruling providence, that everything that happens to men happens at haphazard, that there is no explanation of suffering either in this world or in any other, a belief which leaves too many things unexplained.

The greatest argument for the Christian faith is He who inspires it, Jesus Christ. Every one acknowledges that His is the most peaceful, the least fretful, life ever lived. It was based upon and inspired by His belief in the Fatherhood of God, in God's interest in and love for every child of His hand. That being so, can we believe, as some ask us to believe, that it was based upon a delusion, upon a falsehood? Can we believe that all who profess to see light in His light and who, in the deepest, darkest experiences, bear themselves courageously, are consciously and wittingly deluding themselves and others? No, the one and only explanation of their courage is that through Jesus Christ they have discovered the secret of the braver attitude to life.

Have we discovered that secret? None of us knows what a day may bring forth, but we can decide now whether our attitude to the difficulties which may come our way is to be that of Jacob when he said, 'all these things are against me,' or that of Paul when he said, 'none of these things move me.' If we see in Jesus what Paul saw, his attitude will become ours, for in Jesus we shall have discovered its secret.

Ultimate Aims.

By the Reverend Thomas Shearer, B.D., B.Litt., Glasgow.

What is the ultimate aim of Christianity? This question can best be answered, I think, by comparing and contrasting Christianity with certain other systems. One such comparison is suggested by a recent newspaper correspondence, which discussed whether or not the ultimate aims of Christianity and Communism are identical. Marxist Communism is the most prominent example in the world to-day of what I may call atheistic optimism—that is, lack of faith in God combined with belief in an ultimate good. The logical contrasts to atheistic optimism are obviously atheistic pessimism on the one hand, and theism on the other. Our comparisons therefore fall naturally into a kind of imitation of the Hegelian-Marxist 'dialectic.' For the *thesis* of this 'dialectic' we may take atheistic optimism, as represented by Communism. The *antithesis*, revealing the logical weaknesses of the *thesis*, will be atheistic pessimism, of which Hinayana Buddhism may serve as an example. The *synthesis*, the answer in its turn to pessimism, will be theism, and especially Christianity.

For the purpose of this argument I am ignoring the political and economic aspects of Communism, and am considering only the 'dialectical materialism' of Marx and Lenin. Nor am I greatly concerned with the details even of that semi-philosophy. I am taking it only as a typical example of a point of view that has always had its supporters—the point of view that man need not trouble himself with God, but ought to seek as his ultimate aim the establishment of an ideal human society upon earth. And I am convinced that this point of view is not only wrong, but is not even logically tenable.

There is indeed one theory that gives a plausible motive for altruism in the absence of faith in God. This is the idea that the interests of the group—of the 'State,' the 'community,' 'society,' or some such collective abstraction—are somehow superior to those of the individual, and that the ultimate aim of the individual must be the service of such a group. But I am sure this is a fallacy. As the late Professor A. E. Taylor has argued, an individual animal or man has a degree of unity and a consequent appreciation of experience that a group of animals or men does not possess. A flock or a nation does not see or hear except in a figurative sense—when we say it does, we mean really that the individual members of it see or hear. But, on the contrary, 'a man is not said to see because his eyes see, or to hear because his ears hear. . . . As Plato long ago remarked, it is not the eye which sees or the ear which hears, but the *man* who sees with his eyes and hears with his ears. Scatter the flock or disperse the tribe, and there is still as much seeing and hearing and

feeling as before; resolve the individual animal or man into constituents of any kind, and seeing, hearing and all the characteristic experiences of sheep or men are abolished.'[1] The individual, in fact, is a *centre* or *subject* of experience in a way that the group is not. And this applies to more than seeing and hearing. The group has no *mental* experiences except those of its individual members. Only they can feel, and think, and rejoice or be sad. If they are in sorrow, the group has no compensating joy: if they are glad, the gladness of the group is no more than the gladness of its members. It is true that a well-organized group may add to its members' happiness; but it cannot subjectively feel happiness itself, and therefore in the last resort its success must be judged by the well-being of the individuals in it. A group that possessed great wealth and power, but whose individual members were all miserable, would manifestly not be successful at all. It is therefore almost the reverse of truth to say that the individual must work for the group: rather it is the group that exists for the benefit of the individual.

This notion of the superiority of the group is due, I think, to an ambiguity in the use of words like 'community,' which may refer either to an abstract whole transcending its parts, or to a number of individuals whose lives are inextricably bound together. Unfortunately the distinction is not always realized, and arguments valid only for one meaning are applied by confusion to the other. Recently, for example, I heard a speaker quote Am 5^{4-12} as scriptural evidence for the importance of 'community,' and thence deduce that the Church, the community of Christ, should act as a corporate whole. But Amos is not speaking of corporate action. He is denouncing those rich men (individuals) who by their selfishness are causing suffering to the poor (also individuals); and he is urging the rich individuals to reduce the suffering of the poor ones by giving up their selfishness. The passage may be taken as a plea for 'community,' but only in the second sense. It emphasizes the interdependence of men; but the men are always recognized to be individuals. It is sometimes suggested that individualism is mere selfishness; but that is by no means inevitable. I may work for the good of others. I may even place their good above my own. But work for the good of others is still work for the good of individuals—it is very different from setting the interests of the group above those of the men and women who compose it.

But if our ultimate aim is to be judged by its effect on individuals, Buddhism provides the perfect *antithesis* to atheistic optimism. According to the usual interpretation of Buddha's thought,[2] he did not believe in God (at least in the theistic sense) any more than Marx did; but his deductions from this unbelief were very different from those of Marx, and I think much more defensible. Marx said, 'There is no God: therefore man must make the earthly welfare of his own species the ultimate aim of his life.' Buddha said, 'There is no God: therefore the earthly welfare of man is an illusion. The only conceivable aim is to rid the human race of all desire, and so avoid the otherwise inevitable disappointment.' It was the fact of suffering that led the Buddha to this conclusion; and the same fact is the stumbling-block to all atheistic optimism. Suffering seems likely to exist so long as this world endures. It is unlikely, for example, that old age, death, and accident can ever be entirely eliminated. But even if these evils disappeared, there would still be the sufferings caused by changing circumstances. Change is inevitable. Even in that static classless anarchy which is the Marxist's dream of the millennium—could such a society be achieved—there would still be the changes caused by the mere passing of time. But change, though it may bring improvement, inevitably brings suffering too, if only in the struggle for adaptation to a new environment. Thus, anæsthetics may reduce the pangs of a mother in child-birth; but nothing can eliminate the pangs of the new-born infant in adapting itself to an unfamiliar kind of existence; and so through life. All our efforts, therefore, can only alleviate suffering—they cannot entirely remove it. But is it worth while to struggle for mere alleviation? Is it not more sensible (if there is no God) to follow the Buddha in giving up the struggle, and find peace by the crushing of all desire?

This conclusion is reinforced when we consider the alternatives. What merely worldly aim of life can fully satisfy? It is a commonplace that aims like money and idle pleasure, or even art and learning when pursued purely for their own sake, are only too apt to bring satiety rather than satisfaction. One way out would be to make, not any one of these, but a judicious admixture of them, the chief aim of life—to pass one's time in just as much money-making, as much study, as much pleasure, and so forth, as would prevent any one of them from palling, and give an agreeable

[1] *The Christian Hope of Immortality* [London, 1938], 40–41.

[2] I am aware that this interpretation is sometimes disputed; but that does not affect my argument, which concerns a point of view, whether correctly ascribed to Buddha or not. I use the name 'Buddha' only as a convenient symbol for this point of view. I might instead have used 'Schopenhauer'; but Buddha is a world-figure, comparable in influence with Christ and Marx, and Schopenhauer is not.

variety. But even supposing a man were completely free to adopt such a way of life consistently (and how many are ?), what would it be but a mere pointless means of avoiding boredom as long as life lasted—an elaborate way of wasting time ? And if life has nothing more to offer than an opportunity of wasting time, then (once again) is it worth the struggle ? If, however, we seek to go higher, and adopt as our ultimate aim a more philosophical conception—T. H. Green's 'self-fulfilment,' for example—we find that this too depends for its appeal on some kind of belief in God. For what is the use of 'fulfilling myself' if I am merely a finite speck in a meaningless universe ? What even, in that case, is there for me to fulfil ? As for the Marxist aim—the welfare of the human race—the absence of faith in God reduces that too to futility. As we have seen, we cannot satisfactorily make the service of an abstract whole of humanity our ultimate aim. We might indeed work for the continuance of the species ; but that is worth while only when we have proved that the species has some other reason for continuing, and some have doubted that —Schopenhauer, for example, thought all mankind would be better dead. And when we seek to serve individuals we find ourselves, in the absence of faith in God, faced with all kinds of unexpected difficulties. For in what is our service of others to consist ? Are we to help them to live longer ? Once again, that is worth while only if for some other reason life itself is worth while ; and if life looks beyond itself for its justification, it cannot itself be the ultimate aim. The same argument applies to the cure of disease : it is worth while only if the cured man has some further use for his health—otherwise the best cure might be extinction. Is the aim, then, to be human happiness ? That sounds satisfactory at first hearing ; but how is it to be achieved ? By granting all men's desires ? That, as we have seen, may lead only to satiety, or at the best to a pleasant waste of time that is hardly worth the effort. Besides, as we have also seen, the very nature of life makes it impossible entirely to eliminate sorrow. Arguments similar to these, I believe, will be found to apply against any conceivable aim that the atheistic optimists may put forward. So we are back at the Buddha's conviction of the worthlessness of all human endeavour ; and, if we leave out God, we may well share his conclusion that we can best serve others by teaching them to give up all desires, and so to avoid the pangs of disappointment that come when their desires are unfulfilled.

This seems to me to be the only valid conclusion for an atheist ; but it is very unwelcome. Is there no alternative ? Surely there is. If there is a Being, personal, infinite and eternal, uncreated, self-sufficient, untouched by death or the changes of time and space, then such a Being (whom we call God) can be a satisfying End-in-Himself. Notice that I have not chosen these attributes of God at random. I believe God must be all these things if we are to find in Him a truly satisfying End.[1] He must be infinite and eternal—One who is independent of time and space, has always existed, and must always exist—because otherwise time and space would be superior to Him, and therefore more worthy aims. He must be uncreated and self-sufficient, because He is not an ultimate aim if there is any other reason for His existence. He must be unchanging, because an ultimate aim that was mutable would reduce all life to chaos. I believe, too, that our ultimate aim must be a *personal* God, because only if He is personal can God be responsive to our approaches, and most men need a *responsive* God if they are to feel that His service is worth while.[2] But if God is all these things, He can be Himself our ultimate aim, giving direction to life, and significance to all creation.

Now, Christianity proclaims just such a God, and proclaims Him, because of its faith in Christ, more perfectly (as Christians believe) than any other theistic system. Christianity, therefore, provides the required *synthesis* of Marxism and Buddhism. Since it is realistic in its attitude to evil, it endorses the Buddhist criticism of atheistic optimism ; but on the other hand, through its faith in God, it restores to importance the Marxist aim of human welfare upon earth. Only (and this is the great difference between Christianity and Marxism) to a God-centred Christianity human welfare upon earth will not be an *ultimate* aim, but will be dependent upon, even a by-product of, the service of God. The service of God demands a ceaseless effort to secure the greatest possible earthly welfare of other men and women ; but it includes also much else—such as evangelism and worship—to which the Marxist, because of his materialism, is indifferent or hostile. Christianity is hostile to nothing except evil. If it seeks God first, it will find room in itself for all that is

[1] God may, however, have other attributes too. I have selected only those that are essential for my present purpose.

[2] It is true that Spinoza, who as a Pantheist did not believe in a responsive God, preached an 'intellectual love' of man for God, desiring no return. But I am afraid the plain man's response to that is likely to be, 'Why ?' ; and it is not easy to find an answer. Besides, it is at least arguable that Spinoza's own satisfaction in his 'God-intoxication' was due in part to a residue of belief in a personal God, derived from his earlier Judaism, and colouring his later thought and feeling without his own knowledge.

innocent or good, and give to it all a value that would otherwise be lacking. Christians can claim 'all this and heaven too.'

This becomes clear when we consider, in the light of the Christian faith, those other ultimate aims that we had to dismiss as worthless when we left God out. The Christian faith in God makes these aims worth while, although (and indeed because) they are no longer ultimate. Even money-making and idle pleasure can have a place, though not a high place, in the Christian scheme of things—money-making to provide the necessary sustenance for lives that are on other grounds valuable: pleasure to give a needed respite (all the more enjoyable because now only occasional) from more serious tasks. Art and learning gain even more obviously from being done for the sake of God; and a life of varied interests, which in a Godless world would be mere time-wasting, becomes a high adventure when God is its aim. 'Self-fulfilment,' again, becomes worth while when the self to be fulfilled is a child of God; and the service of others is supremely worth while when they too are God's creatures, and God's immortal creatures. All the arguments against optimism, therefore, which seemed, and rightly seemed, so convincing in the absence of faith in God, are found to be rebutted as soon as God is given His due place.

There does remain one difficulty, the problem of suffering; but even this becomes less sombre in the light of the Christian hope. For, on the one hand, the certainty that God loves us, which is one great message of the Cross of Christ, makes all our suffering easier to bear; and, on the other hand, the promise of eternal life in fellowship with God, by offering us the hope of a complete cessation of all suffering, takes its sting from the pessimist argument. Therefore, although even Christians cannot claim completely to understand the problem of suffering, it does not have on them the paralysing effect that it can have on other sensitive souls.

The ultimate aim of Christianity, therefore, must be nothing less than God Himself—obedience to His will, communion with Him, the bringing of other men into communion with Him too. As the old Scottish Catechism puts it, 'Man's chief end is to glorify God, and to enjoy Him for ever.' Nothing less will satisfy—nothing less will make even our subordinate aims worth while. And indeed it would be strange if it were otherwise; for it is an insult to God to put anything else before Him. 'Thou shalt have no other gods before me,' says the Decalogue; and Jesus Himself, when He is at His most practical, is constantly referring us back to God. Do this or that, He says, 'that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven.' 'Our Father in Heaven' must have precedence even over our brothers upon earth. Only so can we give to these brothers themselves the service that our Father commands.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Calvin Studies. One of the best known of modern students of Calvin, who was not merely a detached scholar but a convinced follower of the great Reformer, was Professor A. Lecerf, who died during the War. A number of his published essays, dating from 1927 to the year before his death, have now been collected and published, with an Introduction by A. Schlemmer.[1] These all deal with some aspect of the thought or teaching of Calvin—for example, the sovereignty of God, predestination, election and the Sacrament, the Church and the administration of the Sacraments, authority, the relations of Church and State, Capitalism—and are designed to recall Calvinists to the purity of their faith as it was expressed by Calvin. The first two of the studies are devoted to the doctrine of the sovereignty of God, which was fundamental to his teaching and which, the author holds, has often been misrepresented. Predestination, which does not figure until the end of the third book of the Institutes, is less fundamental than the conception of God, and Calvin's thought is carefully distinguished from that of Duns Scotus, with which it is often associated. He insists equally on the sovereignty of God and human freedom, and human responsibility is carefully preserved. All of these essays are worthy of attention, and though they first appeared separately over a number of years, there is little repetition. In view of present-day discussions not a few readers will turn with particular interest to the doctrine of the Church and the Sacraments. Many will regret that no further contributions from this enthusiastic exponent of Calvinism can be expected, though the view cited in the Introduction that Professor Lecerf was likely to be the last genuine Calvinist is unduly pessimistic.

[1] A Lecerf, *Études Calvinistes*, recueillies et introduites par A. Schlemmer [1949]. Série Théologique de l'Actualité Protestante. (Delachaux et Niestlé, Neuchatel and Paris; Swiss Fr. 6.)

Hellenism in the Epistle to the Hebrews. A detailed study of the concluding exhortation of the Epistle to the Hebrews has been issued by Dr. J. Cambier, under the title *Eschatology or Hellenism*

in the Epistle to the Hebrews.[1] The discussion centres in the meaning of the verb μένειν in the expression μένουσαν πόλιν . . . μέλλουσαν, but this is studied in the context of the thought of the Epistle as a whole, and in the context of the surrounding verses in particular. The author holds that this is a closely integrated section, and that while the writer of the Epistle borrowed the language of Jewish eschatology his essential thought was quite different from that of the apocalyptic circles and was, indeed, fundamentally Alexandrine. To him the abiding city was wholly other-worldly, and not in a Kingdom of God in this world or in a New Jerusalem, which should be the heavenly counterpart of the earthly Jerusalem. Therein lay its stability and permanence. The whole study is worthy of careful attention, and is both acute and learned. In the course of his discussion the author breaks a lance with Professor O. Cullmann.

Ignatius of Antioch and the Fourth Gospel. The output of theological works from Switzerland continues unabated. Dr. C. Maurer, of Zürich, has now issued a careful study of the relations between Ignatius of Antioch and the Gospel according to St. John.[2] He first uses the evidence of the Rylands Fragment of the Fourth Gospel to show that it is possible that Ignatius could have had access to the Gospel, but highly improbable that the author of the Gospel could have had access to the writings of Ignatius, and therefore if there is direct dependence it is likely to be on the Gospel. Next he turns to the papyrus Egerton 2 to illustrate how the citation of more than one passage can be woven into a mosaic, and then to mixed citations of non-Johannine passages in Ignatius, and finally to the passages in Ignatius which recall the Fourth Gospel, reaching the conclusion that the use of the Fourth Gospel by Ignatius is virtually certain. In the second part of the book, the author examines the theological relationship between Ignatius and the Fourth Gospel, particularly in so far as certain basic ideas are concerned. These are 'the truth,' 'oneness,' and the interpretation of the Eucharist. He shows that Ignatius fills Johannine terms with a Gnostic meaning and is the first misinterpreter of Johannine ideas. The whole forms a valuable study which is warmly to be commended.

[1] *Eschatologie ou Hellenisme dans l'Epître aux Hébreux : une étude sur μένειν et l'exhortation finale de l'Epître* [1949]. Analecta Lovaniensia Biblica et Orientalia, xii. (Desclée de Brouwer, Bruges and Paris, and Nauwelaerts, Louvain ; Fr. 40.)

[2] *Ignatius von Antiochien und das Johannesevangelium* [1949]. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments, xviii. (Zwingli Verlag, Zürich ; Swiss Fr. 9.80.)

A Beth-shan Stele of Seti I. All who are interested in the perennially discussed question of the Ḫabiru of the Amarna letters and the Hebrews should read B. Grdseloff's study of *A Beth-shan Stele of Seti I*.[3] The stele contains a reference to the 'Apiru, and the author gives here his translation of the text after a careful study of it in Jerusalem. It mentions the 'Apiru as located in the mountain of Yarmuth, which Grdseloff identifies with a site west of the Jordan between Beth-shan and the Sea of Galilee. He favours the equation of 'Apiru, Ḫabiru (or Ḫapiru as it should more probably be read, especially in view of some Ras Shamra evidence), and Hebrews, and thinks the reference to three thousand six hundred 'Apiru prisoners from Palestine in a text from the reign of Amenophis II., the references to the Ḫabiru in the Amarna letters, and the present reference to 'Apiru all fit together. Since he places the Exodus *c.* 1225 B.C., and shortens the Sojourn in Egypt to two hundred and fifteen years with the LXX of Ex 12^{40}, he accepts the commonly held view that not all the Hebrews went into Egypt. The complexity of this problem becomes ever greater, and it is well known that many scholars, in view of evidence from Nuzu, deny that Ḫabiru was originally an ethnic term at all. The present study is important because of its examination of one item of the available material, and establishment of the meaning of the text it studies.

Hebrew Ideas of Geography. Professor G. Hölscher has written a short study of the Hebrew ideas of geography, with special reference to three passages.[4] The first chapter deals with the mythical world-picture of the Hebrews and the supposed relations between earth, heaven and the ocean, while the second chapter deals with the geographical knowledge which is reflected in a number of passages. The author then turns to his three chosen passages and compares the restricted range of the conception of Gn 2^{10-14} with the wider range of the conception reflected in the P sections of the table of nations in Gn 10, and the yet wider range of the conception which stands in Jubilees 8–9. In each case the author provides a map to illustrate the ideas expressed in the texts studied, and shows how a fuller knowledge of the world and its peoples came to be acquired. An important part of the study lies necessarily in the identifications of the Hebrew names employed. It is enriched by copious references in the footnotes.

[3] *Une Stèle Scythopolitaine du roi Séthos Ier* [1949]. (Cairo : Le Scribe Egyptien.)

[4] *Drei Erdkarten : ein Beitrag zur Erdkenntnis des hebräischen Altertums* [1949]. Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse [1944–48], No. 3. (Winter, Heidelberg.)

A Ras Shamra Text. One of the Ras Shamra texts, first published by Virolleaud in 1933 under the title of 'The Birth of the Gracious and Beautiful Gods,' but more commonly referred to as SS, has given rise to a great variety of interpretation of its purpose and character. Professor R. Largement has now returned to its consideration.[1] He first reviews the varying theories and observes that in so far as they are positive they consider only a part of the text as the basis for their theory of the whole. There is a want of unity in the form of the text which increases the difficulty of its interpretation and the author of this monograph does not profess to solve all the problem. He gives a transcription and translation of the whole text, followed by careful notes, and finally offers a synthesis of its contents. He thinks the first part of the text describes two rites, one performed in or near the city and the other by the sea; the second part of the poem is an epic fragment which set forth the significance of the rites which preceded. He thus reconciles the ritual view and the mythical view which had earlier been advanced and seeks to integrate them into a view of the whole poem.

The Prophets. Professor Johannes Hempel, editor of the *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* and well known for a whole series of publications in pre-War days, has published his first post-War work in a short but valuable study of the prophets.[2] This is divided into three parts. In the first the author examines the historical and literary background of the prophets; in the second the call of the prophet, both mediate and immediate, and some ten of the prophets who were called; in the third the theology and thought of the prophets. The emphasis on the call is in line with much recent study, and many readers will value all that is said in this section. The ideas of the prophets which are here examined are ethical monotheism and its corollary in demand upon men, the conception of Nature and history, and the Coming God. In this final section we have a brief study of the thought of the goal of history and of the divinely appointed leader of the Messianic Age. Throughout, the treatment is fresh and a large number of prophetic passages are woven into the exposition, so that the author produces a work with a quality and approach of its own in this much cultivated field of the Prophets. Collected at the end are a number of notes with references to much recent literature. Unhappily many of the items are preceded by an asterisk, indicating that the author had no direct access to them under post-War conditions. His own library is lost, and his book has been prepared without access to large libraries, under conditions which would discourage many scholars. Few living Old Testament scholars can bring a greater weight of scholarship to their task, and the chief value of Professor Hempel's book lies in the grasp and penetration he has brought to his study.

Hrozný Festschrift. A worthy tribute to the veteran Czech scholar, Professsor F. Hrozný, whose most widely known work has been associated with Hittite studies, has been planned to celebrate his seventieth birthday by the Czechoslovak Oriental Institute as a work of four volumes, of which the first two, running to nearly nine hundred pages between them, and including over seventy individual contributions by scholars from all over the world, have appeared.[3] It is impossible to record the titles of all the articles, which are written in English, French, German, Russian and Italian, or to indicate the range of the subjects. Most of the essays lie within the field of Hittite or Cuneiform studies, though a number range more widely. Here it must suffice to mention a few essays which are of more direct interest to the Biblical scholar. M. A. Beek studies Is 24–27 and argues that the section rests on an experience of an earthquake. M. Bič considers the sanctuary at Bethel and attempts to get behind our present documents to the original cultic significance of the shrine. D. Daube examines methods of Biblical criticism, and seeks to demonstrate that laws which are found only in late documents of the Pentateuch are already implied in earlier narratives. G. R. Driver finds light thrown on some Biblical problems by passages in the Ugaritic texts. S. N. Kramer adduces evidence of a Blood-Plague, comparable with the first Egyptian plague, in Sumerian mythology. A. F. Puukko studies traces of Levirate marriage in Oriental codes. J. J. Stamm examines the significance of the name Ammon, which he finds to be 'Little Uncle,' and J. Starcky studies the Divine name El, which he connects with the idea of leadership. This can give but little idea, however, of the riches of these volumes, or of the learning that is collected here. And two more volumes have still to appear!

H. H. Rowley.

Manchester University.

---

[1] *La Naissance de l'Aurore : poème mythologique de Ras Shamra-Ugarit* [1949]. Analecta Lovaniensia Biblica et Orientalia, xi. (Duculot, Gembloux and Nauwelaerts, Louvain; Fr. 50.)

[2] *Worte der Profeten* [1949]. (Töpelmann, Berlin.)

[3] *Symbolae ad Studia Orientis pertinentes Frederico Hrozný dedicatae*, Parts 1 and 2 (together forming vol. xvii. of *Archiv Orientální*) [1949]. (Orientální Ustav, Prague; $11.50 each part.)

Contributions and Comments.

'Be Ye Perfect!'

In the October [1949] issue of The Expository Times there is a children's sermon on Mt 5^{48}. The author speaks about the passage, 'Be ye perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect,' and calls this a 'seemingly impossible ideal,' but maintains that 'we shall find that we *can* live it.'

St. Matthew (or whoever the author of the Gospel was) seems to mean on the other hand that the ideal in question is not only 'seemingly,' but absolutely impossible to reach, as he places it in close connexion with the Lord's Prayer, given, as Luke tells us, to the disciples (Lk $11^{1ff.}$). These are taught every day to pray: 'forgive us our debts' ('sins' Lk 11^{4}). Never will there come in the life of any disciple a day when he would not need to offer this prayer. The whole New Testament teaches us the same. The Lord alone could say: 'Which of you convinceth me of sin?' (Jn 8^{46}). Therefore the doubt arises whether the translation is correct.

The word 'perfect' means in English, as in my own language, perfect and nothing else than perfect, without fault, blemish, defect, or the like. About this there is no doubt whatever.

The Greek word, here rendered 'perfect,' comes, as can be easily seen, from a word meaning 'end,' 'goal,' 'ideal' (if you like)—this from a formal point of view. Now we can be connected with the 'goal,' an 'ideal' in two ways. We may have reached it or may at least be wandering ('walking' Ph 3^{16}) toward it, in the direction of it and not in the opposite direction. Ph 3 contains both these significations. In 3^{12} St. Paul thinks of the former meaning and says that he is not 'perfect.' In 3^{15} he thinks of the latter meaning and says that he is 'perfect.' At the same time therefore he (and every Christian) is perfect, 'walking' toward the goal, and not yet perfect, not having reached the goal, the ideal. The Lord cannot mean that the disciples (to whom alone the Sermon on the Mount refers, as only those are in communion with Him and can get the strength they need) were perfect in the sense that they had reached the goal or would reach it in this life. But He meant and could only mean that they ought to 'walk' in the direction toward the goal, the ideal, the right goal, the only goal which could be spoken of from His point of view, not the ideal the Pharisees had placed before men, but the ideal which God Himself had placed before them. And this ideal was He Himself, who 'maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust' (Mt 5^{45}) without making any distinction among men by excluding some from His kindness, in contrast to the Pharisees, who certainly shut out the 'sinners,' the 'publicans' from what they were ready to do to the members of their own 'class.'

It is of the utmost importance that this passage be translated correctly. If not, the scrupulous and conscientious will fall into despair, when they very soon find that the ideal is not only 'seemingly,' but in fact absolutely impossible to reach in this life, while those not so scrupulous and conscientious, necessarily making the same experience, subtract from the demands of the ideal and are soon so happy and satisfied with themselves. Neither consequence of the wrong translation is to be desired.

What the Lord wanted to tell His disciples was that they should—we may perhaps express it thus—take as their ideal God in His perfectness, nothing lower. And if we ask what this rather formal word means St. Luke shows us that thereby is meant God's mercy (6^{36}), in one word what St. Matthew says when he speaks about the sun and the rain.

There are several passages in the official translation of the Sermon on the Mount which give ample room for improvement. We might mention the word 'resist not evil' (5^{39}), further the verse 5^{22}, where the Lord forbids His disciples to follow the practice of the Pharisees of an excommunication in three stages increasing in severity. The portion 6^{25-34} or 7^{1} is misleading in its present translation.

For the above I am mainly indebted to the late Professor K. Bornhäuser of Marburg in Germany. His many books on New Testament exposition seem to be very little known in the English-speaking world. An abridged translation of his book on The Sermon on the Mount has been published in Madras in South India by the Christian Literature Society. He has written books on St. John's Gospel, The Lord's Birth and Childhood, The Addressees of the Epistle to the Hebrews, The Acts, The Passion and the Resurrection (posthumous), Day and Hour in the New Testament, and *Das Wirken des Christus durch Taten und Worte* besides a number of smaller papers in periodicals.

C. Sandegren.

Upsala, Sweden.

'Let the Dead Bury their Dead' (Mt viii. 22, Lk ix. 60).

Dr. Black's suggested paronomasia here is very interesting (The Expository Times, lxi. 219). I suggest, however, that the antanaclasis as commonly found may be differently understood. The point to notice is that the man so addressed was 'another of His disciples' who nevertheless wished to be allowed to return home and await the death of his father, so that, in view of the very short interval which necessarily elapses in the East between death and burial, he might be on the spot 'to bury his father' (cf. To 4^3). That Jesus implied that such a man was *ipso facto* 'spiritually dead' or that those not His disciples were 'the spiritually dead' to whom that duty should be left does not seem very convincing. May it not, therefore, be the case that 'the dead' here means 'the dead *disciple*' in the sense indicated by the practice of Pythagoras in placing a cenotaph in the place formerly occupied by a disciple who had left his School because he had ceased to accord to his discipleship his prime allegiance? If so, the text means that the true disciple is the one who does 'the duty which lies nearest,' in this case, 'goes and preaches the Kingdom of God,' whereas the 'dead disciple' is the one who allows a duty, good in itself but not of immediate concern, to prevent him doing the duty which is of immediate concern (cf. Lk 14^{26}).

T. M. Donn.

Duthil, Inverness-shire.

Entre Nous.

Fore-Dawn.

Fore-Dawn, by Nicodemus (Rockliff: 10s. 6d. net), is a sequel to the same author's well-known volume, 'Midnight Hour.' Once again it consists of extracts from his personal journal. This time, however, the keynote is not the thought of an all-encircling gloom but the faint glimmerings of the dawn which is to come.

The book is obviously the product of a full mind. It is packed with quotations; every page is scattered with allusions. Here indeed, if anywhere, is its defect. It is not a book which can be appreciated except by some one who is equally well read. The author has a liking for unusual words like 'inconscious,' 'autopistic,' 'clerisy.' He has a quite undue fondness for sprinkling his pages with words in Latin, French, and Greek where English could just as well have been used. This is a pity because it is a habit which does not impress the scholar and which ruins the book for the man without the necessary linguistic equipment to understand it. These things are only part of the consequence that the book is an exceedingly self-conscious book.

The author's interests are obviously extremely wide. We see him listening to theological lectures, digging in his garden, attending a rugby football match, and, although he is not a parson, conducting a simple evensong in some little village hall. On everything he reflects and reflects to the most excellent purpose. He is possessed of a magnificent English style, especially when he writes of Nature, which he does with the passionate love of beauty of one who knows that this is God's world. Many of the most valuable sections of the book are wise and penetrating expositions of Scripture which really do throw a new light on the passages with which they deal. He can coin the epigrammatic phrase. 'No event is ever accidental unless we let it be so.' He quotes Martin Buber as saying that 'the history of Israel, the history that most matters runs not from success to success but from failure to failure.'

There is an extraordinarily penetrating comparison of Martin Buber and Nicolas Berdyaev. Buber, he says, is a man of the 'first,' Berdyaev a man of the 'second immediacy.' 'Buber has re-seen and re-illumined in his gospel of "meeting" man's duty to his neighbour, and he remains a glowing elder brother and counsellor in the world of men. Berdyaev has "voyaged on strange seas of thought (and spirit) alone," has made the "flight of the alone to the Alone." . . . One would follow Buber as a great friend; one would follow Berdyaev as a master of the mystery of being.'

There may be things which irritate in this book, as the rather intellectually snobbish preference for foreign words does, but the fact remains it is a privilege, for which we must be sincerely thankful, to share the self-communings and the excursions and the reflections of so fine and so well-stored a mind.

William Barclay.

Printed in Scotland by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.